DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 092 178 IR 000 749

AUTHOR Spurling, Norman Kent
TITLE Information Needs and Bibliographic Problems of the Anthropology Departments at U. N. C. and Duke University.
INSTITUTION North Carolina Univ., Chapel Hill. School of Library Science.
PUB DATE Sep 73
NOTE 142p.; Master's Thesis, University of North Carolina

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$6.60 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Anthropology; Bibliographies; *College Faculty; Graduate Students; *Information Needs; Information Retrieval; Information Sources; *Information Utilization; Libraries; Library Collections; Library Facilities; *Library Services; Library Surveys
IDENTIFIERS Duke University; *North Carolina; University of North Carolina

ABSTRACT

Research was conducted on information needs and bibliographic problems of anthropologists at Duke University and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Sixty-four faculty members and graduate students were surveyed, and twenty faculty members were interviewed. Many areas of information retrieval problems and the different ways anthropologists use their literature and libraries were explored, and results showed that differences between the various sub-groups of the study population were relatively unimportant. Forty percent of the faculty members did not often use libraries. Few anthropologists made use of abstracting and indexing services, but most were relatively satisfied with available library collections, although they found them to be inadequately organized and too scattered. Major retrieval problems were not finding enough multiple copies and difficulties in obtaining unpublished material. Eighty percent of the faculty members felt library research would be more important in the future. (Author/WH)

ED 092178

INFORMATION NEEDS AND BIBLIOGRAPHIC PROBLEMS OF THE ANTHROPOLOGY DEPARTMENTS AT U. N. C. AND DUKE UNIVERSITY

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: IR SO
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

by

Norman Kent Spurling

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A research paper submitted to the faculty of the School of Library Science of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Library Science.

Chapel Hill

September, 1973

Approved by:

_____

Adviser

IR 000 749

"Information Needs and Bibliographic Problems of the Anthropology Departments at U.N.C. and Duke University."--Abstract

This study presents the findings of research on information needs and bibliographic problems of anthropologists at Duke University and U.N.C. at Chapel Hill. Sixty-four faculty members and graduate students were surveyed, and twenty faculty members were interviewed. The research explored many areas of information retrieval problems and the different ways anthropologists use their literature and libraries. Comparisons were drawn between survey results for the Duke--U.N.C. sample and Diana Amsden's sample of professional anthropologists, between Duke and U.N.C. departments, and between faculty members and graduate students.

Results showed that differences between these pairs existed, but most were relatively unimportant. Faculty members subscribed to the most important journals, while students did not. Forty per cent of the faculty members did not often use libraries. Few anthropologists made use of abstracting and indexing services. Duke and U.N.C. anthropologists were relatively satisfied with available library collections, although they found them to be inadequately organized and too scattered. Major retrieval problems were not finding enough multiple copies and difficulties in obtaining unpublished material. Conversation with other anthropologists and footnotes and bibliographies in books appear to be the main sources used to keep up with the literature and progress in the field. Use of HRAF was extremely limited, and subjects realized they were not making the best use of available resources. Eighty per cent of the faculty members felt library research would be more important in the future.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION, METHODOLOGY, AND OBJECTIVES . . .	1
	Introduction	1
	Methodology	4
	Objectives	7
II.	ANALYSIS OF THE SURVEY DATA	10
	Academic Status of the Sample	10
	Years of Experience in the Same Status . . .	12
	Highest Academic Degree Held	14
	Year Most Recent Degree Was Earned	16
	Subject Areas of Specialization Within Anthropology	17
	Assistance in Library Work	19
	Comparison With Amsden's Background Characteristics	20
	Most Time-Consuming Activities	22
	Publications	26
	Foreign Language Usage	29
	Ways Used to Gain Information About Anthropology	32
	Subject Areas Outside Anthropology	36
	Hours Spent Per Week Getting Information . .	39
	Serials	42
	Number of Periodicals Subscriptions	44
	Abstracting and Indexing Services	46
	Importance of Forms of Literature and Ease of Success in Their Use	47
	Importance of Library Services	52
	Problems in Gathering Information	55
	Summary of Conclusions	59
III.	ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVIEW DATA	61
	Interviewees' Reactions to the Survey	62
	Years of Experience with the Respective Library System	62
	Extent of Satisfaction with Collections . . .	62
	Use of Resources Outside of the Home Universities.	65
	Orientation of Information Needs	66
	Library Research in Relation to Field Work .	70
	Prepublication Communication	72
	Field and Lab Notes	75
	Value of a Hypothetical Newsletter Information Service	76
	Computers	78
	Miscellaneous Observations, Criticisms, and Recommendations	80
	Summary of Conclusions	84

Chapter Page

IV. CONCLUSIONS 87

APPENDICES

A. SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE 100

B. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 105

C. SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES 108

BIBLIOGRAPHY 132

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Composition of the Sample	11
2.	Years in the Status of Faculty	13
3.	Years in the Status of Graduate Student	14
4.	Degrees Held by Subjects	15
5.	Summarized Subject Areas Within Anthropology	18
6.	Decades in Which Last Degree was Earned by Faculty Compared with Amsden's Sample	21
7.	Faculties' Most Time-Consuming Activities (Counting Those Activities Ranked First and Second)	23
8.	Published Items (1968-1973)	28
9.	Foreign Language Usage	30
10.	Ways Used to Gain Information About Anthropology	33
11.	Subject Areas Outside Anthropology	36
12.	Ten Most Frequently Cited Subject Areas Outside Anthropology	37
13.	Hours Spent Per Week Getting Information	40
14.	Most Frequently Used Periodicals (By Entire Sample)	43
15.	Number of Periodicals Subscriptions	45
16.	Importance of Forms of Literature and Ease of Success in Their Use	48
17.	Importance of Library Services	53
18.	Problems in Gathering Information	56
19.	Composition of the Sample (By Field of Specialization)	61
20.	Subject Areas Within Anthropology	109
21.	Ways Used to Gain Information About Anthropology Analyzed by Academic Status	112

Table		Page
22.	Ways Used to Gain Information About Anthropology Analyzed by University	113
23.	Subject Areas Outside of Anthropology.	114
24.	Serials	116
25.	Indexes and Abstracts.	119
26.	Importance of Forms of Literature and Ease of Success in Their Use (Faculty Respondents) . .	120
27.	Importance of Forms of Literature and Ease of Success in Their Use (Student Respondents) . .	121
28.	Importance of Forms of Literature and Ease of Success in Their Use (Duke Respondents). . . .	122
29.	Importance of Forms of Literature and Ease of Success in Their Use (U. N. C. Respondents). .	123
30.	Importance of Library Services for Faculty . . .	124
31.	Importance of Library Services for Students. . .	125
32.	Importance of Library Services for Duke Respondents.	126
33.	Importance of Library Services for U. N. C. Respondents.	127
34.	Problems of Faculty Members in Gathering Information.	128
35.	Problems of Students in Gathering Information. .	129
36.	Problems of Duke Respondents in Gathering Information.	130
37.	Problems of U. N. C. Respondents in Gathering Information.	131

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION, METHODOLOGY, AND OBJECTIVES

Introduction

What is the reason for studying how anthropologists use the library? Why bother to study how they use anthropological literature? These are some of the questions asked of the researcher during the course of this study. The easiest answer and the original cause for the research lie in library problems the author himself experienced while studying anthropology at Duke University from 1970 to 1971.

The author's interest in the nature of anthropological literature began when it first occurred to him that the sheer bulk of anthropological literature was forcing anthropologists to become specialists in sometimes minute areas of the entire field. Personal experience, thus, led to curiosity about the relatively untouched subject area of anthropological information retrieval problems. The primary reasons for conducting this research were simply to find out more about library and literature problems which anthropologists experience and to find out what kinds of information retrieval problems they do have. Exploratory research of this sort would logically be the first step towards solving any kinds of problems anthropologists do have.

It is an understatement to say that very little

research has been done in the area of anthropological information retrieval. A search through Library Literature and Library and Information Science Abstracts over the last twenty-three years discovers only four articles specifically related to this problem with a few other articles less closely related. The anthropological literature on bibliographic problems is, however, growing, particularly in the areas of African and Asian bibliography. Also, anthropologists have been publishing more on the teaching of anthropology and how the field fits into the university research and teaching contexts. The Human Relations Area Files organization publishes Behavior Science Notes, which sometimes includes articles on the organization of anthropological information. Nevertheless, research showing how anthropologists go about using their literature and research showing what they really need and use is extremely rare. This paper is intended to contribute to this limited literature by exploring the information needs and bibliographic problems of the anthropology departments of Duke University and the University of North Carolina.

Anthropologists have long experienced extreme bibliographic problems and have long realized their difficulties, even if librarians have not. George Peter Murdock, one of the founders of the Human Relations Area Files, wrote in 1953:

> In sheer bulk, the mass of descriptive material of interest to the anthropologists probably exceeds by several times that of all the rest of the social sciences put together. Psychologists, sociologists, economists, and geographers depend in the main upon the materials they themselves have accumulated, but

> for the anthropologists the data assembled by themselves constitute but a small proportion of the descriptive materials upon which they depend and must be augmented by vast quantities of information gathered by travelers, missionaries, government officials, artists, natural scientists, and historians, as well as by social scientists of several sister-disciplines.[1]

Not only the size of the literature, but its sheer eclecticism appeared to the author to present problems for the academic library. One problem discovered through personal experience involves the classification schemes in use in academic libraries. The Dewey Decimal System, for example, separates general anthropology and biological anthropology (572 and 573) from linguistic fields (400's) and from historical fields (900's). The Library of Congress system separates the main anthropology section (GN) from the archeological and historical sections (C to F) and from linguistics (P) and from biological fields such as natural history, zoology, and anatomy (QH to QM). In addition, government documents are often separated from both of these schemes because many libraries use the Superintendent of Documents classification system.[2] All of these factors make browsing and keeping up to date with what the library has to offer extremely time-consuming.

To the author, it seemed that there were many other difficulties. Many libraries would probably be unable to

---

[1]George Peter Murdock, "The Processing of Anthropological Materials," in Anthropology Today, ed. by A. L. Kroeber (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), p. 476.

[2]Charles Frantz, The Student Anthropologist's Handbook; a Guide to Research, Training, and Career (Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Pub. Co., 1972), p. 106, p. 124.

subscribe to enough of the foreign newspapers, ephemeral literature, and foreign journals crucial to anthropologists who concentrate on exotic geographical area interests. Even if this literature were not too expensive, it likely would be difficult to order and would likely not be long available for purchase. Furthermore, if an anthropologist specializing in the ethnography of a particular ethnic unit decides to move to another university, the faculty member who replaces him may be interested in a different ethnic unit on a completely different continent; thus, it likely is very difficult for a library to maintain continuity in its collection building, especially in times such as these, when there is often a high rate of faculty turnover.

There were many other questions that needed to be asked. From firsthand experience it appeared that Duke faculty members relied heavily on their personal collections and their own personal contacts for learning about progress in the field. Conferences and prepublication communication seemed to play an extremely important role in the information retrieval process anthropologists used. These were just a few of the natural questions to be asked in an exploratory study of this field. Many other questions relating to how anthropologists use forms of literature and types of library services were, therefore, asked in the process of the research.

Methodology

The form of research used involved surveying and interviewing members of the anthropology departments of Duke

University and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (hereafter referred to as U. N. C.). Although many of the topics for research derived from personal experiences of the author, the final form of the survey questionnaire was heavily based on research published by Diana Amsden in 1968.[3] In seeking to study the information problems of anthropologists, she prepared a very thoroughgoing survey, which she mailed to an international sample of anthropologists. A great amount of credit belongs to her for both the inspiration for this study and for the actual content of many of the survey questions. Although the precise wording of her questions was unavailable at the time of this research, survey questions for this research were constructed so as to provide data closely comparable to hers.

The questions for this survey research were devised in the early months of 1973, and in this period attempts were made to publicize the forthcoming survey in the anthropology Newsletter printed by the U. N. C. department. Signs were placed on the bulletin boards and in the offices at both departments, and publicity at Duke University also included some word of mouth communication to fellow students and faculty.

Before the prospective survey was mimeographed, it was shown to five people, including anthropology students and faculty and one library science professor. Changes

---

[3]Diana Amsden, "Information Problems of Anthropologists," College and Research Libraries, XXIX (March, 1968), 117-31.

were made to improve the survey before it was mimeographed in its final form. Surveys were finally placed in the departmental mailboxes of both universities in the last two weeks of March, 1973, and they were distributed to faculty and registered graduate students in residence at that time. U. N. C. subjects were asked to return their surveys to a large box in the departmental office, and Duke subjects were asked to return theirs to the departmental secretaries. All responses were anonymous.

It will readily be noted that the survey return from Duke University was extremely good. This may be credited to the secretaries of the department, one of whom volunteered to keep a list of those who had returned their surveys. After a few weeks those who had not yet returned their surveys were sent personal reminders. At U. N. C. those who did not return their surveys in the first two weeks were reminded by signs in the office and on departmental bulletin boards.

Interviewing of faculty members in both departments began after the survey was distributed and continued through the remainder of the spring and early summer. The object of the interviews was to gather further information on related topics of information retrieval problems of anthropologists and also to learn more about how faculty members use the library resources in the Triangle Region of North Carolina.

Interviews were open-ended and usually lasted a half-hour or longer. Because of the length of the interviews

and because of the difficulty of scheduling appointments, it was impossible to interview all faculty members at both departments. As the best alternative the researcher decided to interview as many faculty members as possible, making certain that a socio-cultural anthropologist, a physical anthropologist, a linguist, and an archeologist were represented from each university. Also, since Duke's department was smaller in numbers, it was necessary to interview a higher proportion of their faculty in order to give some balance to the results.

By using the method of interviewing, the author hoped to strengthen some of the findings of the survey and also to learn some of the faculty members' opinions on what could be done to improve library services at the two campuses. It will not be claimed that their opinions are representative of all anthropologists, but hopefully, librarians reading this paper will give their recommendations serious consideration.

Objectives

Throughout the research the overall objectives were to provide answers to the following questions:

1. Do the problems and needs of these faculty members and graduate students differ from those found in the above-mentioned survey by Diana Amsden, and if so, how do they differ?

2. In what ways (if at all) do the information needs of graduate students differ from those of the faculties at the two universities.

3. Are there differences between the responses of Duke faculty members and graduate students and

U. N. C. faculty members and graduate students, and if so, why do these differences exist?

Findings from this research will be presented in the following manner: The first major section will include findings from the survey research together with comparison with Amsden's research, generally question by question. The second major section will present the findings from the interview data, question by question. The final chapter will summarize conclusions.

This is an exploratory study in that it covers a wide range of topics in a field where little has been written and where little is known. It does not pretend to be the final word on these matters, nor does this sample of sixty-four represent all anthropologists. It is fair, however, to say that the sample is representative of the anthropology departments at U. N. C. at Chapel Hill and Duke University, and the author is much indebted to all who gave of their time to participate. Conclusions from this research should, hopefully, apply to a great number of anthropology departments in American colleges and universities, but until further research is completed, we have no way of knowing for certain. Some of the possible variations should be made clear by comparison between this data and Amsden's data.

Hopefully, in the process of this survey, anthropologists have learned more about what libraries <u>can</u> provide. Through the interview process, they have in a few cases learned more about why librarians do things in the ways they do. Perhaps, this research has given the subjects pause

to reflect on the ways libraries do help them out. If this is so, then the study should help to strengthen good will between the departments and their respective libraries. If nothing else, it should encourage members of one department to explore the collections of the other university's library, and hopefully, it should encourage closer cooperation between the two departments concerned.

CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF THE SURVEY DATA

Academic Status of the Sample

The first nine questions of the survey attempted to discover various facts about the education and experience of the sample population. The sample group was composed of sixty-four respondents, twenty-three of whom were faculty members and forty-one of whom were graduate students in anthropology. This represents a reasonably good return overall. For Duke it accounts for twenty-seven out of thirty departmental members in residence (90 per cent). For U. N. C. the sample population included thirteen out of twenty-two faculty members in residence[1] (59 per cent) and twenty-four out of forty-five registered graduate students in residence (53 per cent).

One of the objects of this paper is to compare the newly found results with those collected by Diana Amsden, and these comparisons will be made as the survey results are discussed, generally question by question. Because her survey was mailed to anthropologists listed in "Associates

---

[1]The U. N. C. sample included one professor from the Linguistics Department. This individual's courses were cross-listed with anthropology, and his interests were reasonably closely aligned with anthropological linguistics.

in Current Anthropology" in the Current Anthropology for December, 1965, her results were based solely on professional anthropologists, and one would expect her findings to correlate more closely with this study's faculty results rather than this study's student or total results.

TABLE 1

COMPOSITION OF THE SAMPLE

	Duke	U. N. C.	Total	Percentage
Faculty members	10 (37%)	13 (35%)	23	(36%)
Graduate students, non-teaching	11 (41%)	20 (54%)	31	(48%)
Graduate students, teaching	6 (22%)	4 (11%)	10	(16%)
Totals	27	37	64	
% of total sample	(42%)	(58%)		(100%)

Amsden mailed her survey to 250 anthropologists; yet, she received only 76 usable responses (30.4 per cent). The Duke-U. N. C. research produced a substantially higher rate of return, but such a sample based on faculty and students in residence should be expected to provide a higher rate of return, especially considering the ease of dropping a survey into a box when compared with mailing it. Also, it should be noted that the Duke-U. N. C. research does not cover everyone affiliated with the two departments. Duke University had at least five graduate students writing their dissertations, teaching, or doing fieldwork in other locales. U. N. C. had at least twenty-six graduate students not registered or not in residence because, in practice, one does not have to register to study for doctoral exams or to write master's and doctoral

papers. Since many are out-of-town and therefore less closely concerned with the use of U. N. C. libraries, they were not included in this study. Nevertheless, out-of-town anthropology students have problems of their own which deserve attention, and perhaps the next research can attack their information retrieval problems directly.

Years of Experience in the Same Status

When asked "How many years have you been a graduate student or a faculty member?", subjects naturally provided a wide range of response. The range at Duke covered from one to thirty-four years, and the responses from U. N. C. varied from one to twenty-six years. Fortunately, all of the cases of extremely long tenure represent faculty members rather than graduate students!

While 60 per cent of the Duke faculty have been faculty members for four years or less, 90 per cent have been faculty members for eight years or less. Thus, Duke's department has changed markedly in the last few years. By contrast, the faculty of U. N. C. has changed much more slowly. Only 25 per cent of their faculty report being faculty members for four years or less, 50 per cent report being faculty members for six years or less, and only nine out of twelve cases (75 per cent) report being faculty members for eleven years or less. Three of the U. N. C. faculty sample had been faculty members for twenty years or longer, while this was the case with only one Duke professor.

TABLE 2

YEARS IN THE STATUS OF FACULTY

	Duke	U. N. C.	Total
Mean	7.1	11.5	9.5
Median	4	7	6
	(n=10)	(n=12)	(n=22)

One problem with interpreting this information is that a few of the faculty members (under five) most probably took this question to mean "How many years have you been a faculty member at this institution?", even though the question was not phrased this way. The answers given in these cases could not be discarded, because survey returns were anonymous, and there was no way to tell for certain which answers would distort the picture. The object of the question was really to determine how much experience individuals have had in their present status as either faculty members or graduate students--not to find out how long they have been at their respective universities. Nevertheless, from the data collected in Question IV, it appears that most people have answered Question II as it was intended.

As for the graduate students, the most obvious difference between the teaching and non-teaching graduate students was the fact that no teaching graduate student was in his first year. Because of this, the non-teaching graduate students showed a higher mean number of years in the graduate student status, although the most frequently answered number, the mode, for graduate students was two years.

TABLE 3

YEARS IN THE STATUS OF GRADUATE STUDENT

	Duke		U. N. C.		Total
	GNT[a]	GT	GNT	GT	
Mean	2.5	3.2	2.7	3.5	2.8
Median	1.5	2.0	2.0	3.5	2.0
n	11	6	20	4	41

[a]GNT=non-teaching graduate students, GT=teaching graduate students.

There was little difference between the figures for Duke (mean for total=2.7) and U. N. C. (total for mean= 2.8). The slightly higher mean number of years for U. N. C. students is probably attributable to the fact that they are not required to take their doctoral exams at a specific time in their first few years of graduate study. Thus, U. N. C. students may stay on longer before taking any exams, while Duke students are required to take their comprehensive exams at the end of their first year. The weeding process involved may have its effect on the statistics for number of years in the graduate student status.

Highest Academic Degree Held

Of the survey sample twenty-four held B.A.'s or B.S.'s, seventeen held M.A.'s or M.S.'s, and twenty-three held Ph.D.'s. All faculty members checked the category of "Ph.D. or equivalent advanced degree." One Duke faculty member listed his as A.B.T., while one U. N. C. faculty member held an M.D.

The other significant observation to be made regarding the sample is that U. N. C. students have a strikingly higher

TABLE 4

DEGREES HELD BY SUBJECTS

	Duke			U. N. C.			Totals	
	F[a]	G1	G2	F	G1	G2	T	%
B.A. or B.S.	0	8 73%	5 83%		10 50%	1 25%	24	38%
M.A. or M.S.	0	3 27%	1 17%	0	10 50%	3 75%	17	27
Ph.D. or equivalent	10 100%	0	0	13 100%	0	0	23	36
Totals	10	11	6	13	20	4	64	101%[b]

[a] F=faculty members, G1=non-teaching graduate students, G2=teaching graduate students.

[b] Percentage totals do not equal 100% due to rounding.

number of M.A.'s. Only four out of seventeen graduate students at Duke (23.5 per cent) have M.A.'s, while thirteen out of twenty-four graduate students at U. N. C. (54.2 per cent) do have them. This can easily be explained because Duke's anthropology department does not normally give master's degrees, while at U. N. C. it is normally a prerequisite for working on the doctorate. Although Duke does give master's degrees in rare cases, it is more likely that the four Duke students who hold master's degrees have earned them from other universities.

Year Most Recent Degree Was Earned

For the date when these degrees were earned, there is naturally a wide range in both universities. For faculty members at Duke the range runs from 1973 to 1937, and for faculty members at U. N. C. the range runs from 1971 to 1946. The median value for Duke is 1969 (n=9), whereas for U. N. C. the median is 1966 (n=12). Together with the data from Question II, these statistics can ben interpreted as showing that U. N. C.'s faculty has had slightly more experience in teaching. These conclusions are, however, based on responses from only half of the U. N. C. faculty, so they should not be stretched too far.

The graduate students naturally showed a much narrower range in terms of when the last degree was earned. For Duke answers ranged from 1973 to 1967, while the U. N. C. answers ran from 1973 to 1968. This is a little surprising because it implies that both departments admit few if any

students who have been outside the educational process for very long. Not one graduate student out of forty-one in this study had earned his last degree more than six years ago.

Differences between non-teaching and teaching graduate students were minor even though teaching graduate students at both universities received their last degree more recently than did non-teaching graduate students. For all of the Duke students the modal year was 1971, and the median year was 1970. For all U. N. C. students the modal year was 1972, while the median year was 1971. The median and modal years for the total sample were both 1971. The more recent figures for U. N. C. students can again be explained as a result of the higher proportion of master's degrees they hold.

Subject Areas of Specialization Within Anthropology

In attempting to learn what subject areas these anthropologists were interested in, the question was deliberately left open ended: "What are your most important areas of specialization within the broad spectrum of anthropology?" Although a wide range of different fields was expected, the actual variation of different specialty areas was extraordinary. The 64 respondents cited a total of 115 different areas of specialization within anthropology, although many of these topics are closely related to each other.

In order to make this data more manageable, specific subject areas have been grouped into larger fields as indicated in Table 5.

TABLE 5

SUMMARIZED SUBJECT AREAS WITHIN ANTHROPOLOGY[a]

	Duke	U. N. C.	Total
Life Sciences[b]	19	24	43
Physical Sciences and Archeology	3	6	9
Applied Fields	1	9	10
Sociocultural and other Related Fields	43	52	95
Linguistics	11	9	20
Area Studies	9	13	22
(n=64)	86	113	199

[a]The complete results are included in Table 20 in Appendix C.
[b]Includes medical anthropology.

From this breakdown it is clear that interests of all of the traditional broad areas of anthropology are represented at both universities. Interests in sociocultural anthropology and the life sciences run strong at both universities, although physical anthropology appears slightly stronger at Duke than at U. N. C. Special cultural interest areas were cited fairly often and more so at U. N. C. than at Duke. Archeology was cited surprisingly few times, partly because Duke's anthropology department has this year for the first time hired an archeologist for its faculty. The small number of U. N. C. department members who mentioned archeology is likely misleading; it almost certainly does not well represent the total number of U. N. C. graduate students and faculty members working in that area. The clearest finding from this question is that the U. N. C. department shows a much greater concentration in applied areas of

anthropology, and interviews of the faculty reinforced this finding.

Assistance in Library Work

Next, it was asked whether teaching members of the two departments have assistants who help in doing library research. This was asked in order to find out if professors have to do their own library work by themselves, and results showed that they normally do. Only three faculty members at Duke and one at U. N. C. gave indication that they had such assistance in this way. The U. N. C. respondent answered by saying, "No or very seldom," implying that he or she did have assistants who did library work occasionally. Later, in the process of interviewing, it was discovered that two U. N. C. faculty members had in past years had student assistants who served as bibliographic searchers. At present one U. N. C. faculty member has several graduate students working for him on a major research project which involves library research. Individual students do the portion of the library research which correlates with their segment of the overall project. Since this professor did not answer "yes" to this survey question, it is clear that the question did not ferret out all of the cases in which a faculty member is assisted in library work. Nonetheless, the conclusion that faculty members have very little assistance in library work still holds true.

Since faculty members gave only three descriptions of the types of library work assistants do for them, all

three cases may be readily quoted here. All three were Duke faculty members. The responses were, "All sorts, check references in most cases," "Sorting out sources for research," and "Bibliography; getting books; checking card catalog for correct references." Thus, at least three-tenths of the Duke faculty who responded enjoy assistance in their library work; yet, in no case was there mention of an assistant who abstracted or summarized the contents of the sources being researched. A faculty member who had an assistant available for doing library research would not necessarily lose familiarity with the library's resources. Nor would having such an assistant prove that these particular faculty members are especially heavy users of library resources, although from interviews the author suspects that this is the case. In sum, these figures simply show that three out of ten of the Duke faculty members who responded enjoy this luxury, while only one out of thirteen U. N. C. faculty members even mentioned it as a possibility.

Comparison with Amsden's Background Characteristics

To compare the results from the first few questions with Diana Amsden's results, figures from the Duke and U. N. C. faculty will be most germane. In brief, her sample had seventy-six usable responses from sixty-two anthropologists with Ph.D.'s, five with Master's degrees, four with Bachelor's degrees, and two with other kinds of degrees awarded in foreign countries. Her sample included four people who earned their degrees between 1910 and 1929 and

TABLE 6

DECADES IN WHICH LAST DEGREE WAS EARNED BY FACULTY

COMPARED WITH AMSDEN'S SAMPLE

Years	Duke	U. N. C.	Total	%	Years	Amsden's Totals	%
1970-73	4	4	8	39%	1960-65	19	26%
1960-69	3	4	7	33	1950-59	32	44
1950-59	1	3	4	19	1940-49	12	16
1940-49	0	1	1	5	1930-39	6	8
1930-39	1	0	1	5	1920-29	2	3
					1910-19	2	3
Totals	9[a]	12	21	101%[b]		73	100%

[a]Answers were missing from one Duke and one U. N. C. faculty member.

[b]Percentages do not total 100% due to rounding.

only nineteen who earned their degrees in the 1960's. The modal decade cited was the 1950's, and over 40 per cent of her sample earned their degrees at that time. She felt her sample was disproportionately young, but in relation to the faculties of Duke and U. N. C., her sample was disproportionately old.

Her sample was also different in that it included anthropologists not working in colleges and universities. When she asked what types of institutions her subjects worked at, the categories "University" and "College" only amounted to fifty-four out of eighty-four total answers. Some answered more than one category, but regardless, up to 35.7 per cent of her sample were not working in an academic setting. These others were teaching in high schools and prep schools or doing research or work for governmental organizations or museums.

Most Time-Consuming Activities

Interestingly enough, differences between her sample and the Duke-U. N. C. faculty sample were minor when subjects were asked to rank their most time-consuming activities. For her sample group teaching was "far in the lead mentioned first or second by forty-six respondents, followed by administration, writing, non-fieldwork research, fieldwork, and museum work."[1] Her rank order is figured by adding together the number of times an activity is mentioned as being first or second in importance.

When the same calculations are made on the Duke-

[1] Amsden, "Information Problems of Anthropologists," p. 124.

TABLE 7

FACULTIES' MOST TIME-CONSUMING ACTIVITIES

(COUNTING THOSE ACTIVITIES RANKED FIRST AND SECOND)

	First		Second		Totals		
	Duke	U. N. C.	Duke	U. N. C.	Duke	U. N. C.	Total
Administration	1	4	1	4	2	8	10
Consultation	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Fieldwork	1	0	0	1	1	1	2
Other research	1	0	3	0	4	0	4
Editing	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Teaching	5	7	3	4	8	11	19
Writing	1	2	3	1	4	3	7
Other	1	0	0	0	1	0	1

U. N. C. faculty data, we find that teaching again is far in the lead, followed by administration, writing, other research, and fieldwork. If the three most time-consuming activities are totalled for the Duke-U. N. C. sample, the order becomes: teaching, writing, administration, "other research," with a tie between consultation, fieldwork, and "other research," with editing in last place. For the entire sample of Duke and U. N. C. faculty members, teaching was clearly the most time-consuming activity, while writing, administration, and the "other research" category are consistently ranked in the top four time-consuming activities.

There was only one significant difference between faculty members of the two universities. Duke faculty members place far less emphasis on administration than do the U. N. C. respondents.[2] The survey did not determine whether this results from a higher amount of paper work at U. N. C. or whether it is a function of truly different types of roles at U. N. C. Interview research seemed to support the latter answer because several faculty members at U. N. C. participate actively in applied programs, and one is primarily involved in administering grant funds.

Since this question was oriented mainly towards faculty members, students considered their most time-consuming activity

---

[2]The Duke faculty also appears to place heavier emphasis on the "other research" category if one only counts first and second most time-consuming activities; however, if one includes first, second, and third rankings, then the U. N. C. faculty lists this category more often than does the Duke faculty.

to be "other." They specified reading, studying, and going to class within this category, instead of considering reading and studying to fall into the category of "other research." If one totals responses given for first and second most time-consuming activities, students ranked the possibilities in the following order: "other," writing, "other research," teaching, fieldwork, editing, with no answers given for administration or consultation.[3] If one totals responses given for the first three most time-consuming activities, the shift is slight: fieldwork and teaching trade places in the order, while "other," writing, and "other research" still remain most important. Differences between Duke and U. N. C. students are insignificant.

This information is valuable only insofar as it clarifies how students and faculty spend their time. Several people had difficulty answering this block of questions, and one U. N. C. faculty member made the observation that some of the categories were not strictly comparable. Fieldwork may be concentrated into a summer or an entire year, when one would do nothing else. The answers of anthropologists on campus would likely reflect low importance for fieldwork unless the respondent tried to estimate how time is spent over a period of many years. This is admittedly a difficult task, and even if it were possible, answers based on time

---

[3]It should be mentioned that Amsden included the category of museum work. Since the U. N. C. archeology museum had been closed before the survey began, the author felt this category would not be useful on this survey.

use for the current year would be more relevant to the purposes of this particular study. Work done five years ago might have involved totally different uses of time and information.

As expected, activities such as studying ("other"), "other research," and writing take much of the students' time, and these are all areas where libraries can be useful. Faculty members spend a much higher proportion of their time in administration; this may possibly reduce their time available for library research, but this is a hypothesis which was not tested in the survey.[4]

Publications

This composite question was asked in order to find out how productive Duke and U. N. C. anthropologists were in terms of publications. Although pure numbers of publications are not a direct function of research activity involving libraries, numbers, hopefully, do reflect to some extent the total research activity of a faculty. There is no objective measure of the quality of publications, but the prolificness of an author should normally reflect to some extent the amount of background information retrieval he has done, whether it be through letters to friends, information gained at conferences, or information gained through other means. If we assume that a published article reflects genuine creativity, then the numbers of publications a person

---

[4]See pp. 39-42 for the amount of time spent in pursuit of anthropology.

produces should be a measure of the creativity of the individual and the university he represents.

The question was worded "How many publications have you produced in the last five years?", and this created the problem of whether or not to count works edited or coauthored as equivalent to those authored individually. It was decided to include these on an equal basis because all demonstrate the creativity and industriousness that are being measured.

At neither Duke nor U. N. C. has a student authored a book, although one U. N. C. student has coedited a book. At Duke two faculty members have produced one book each, one has produced two monographs, and two have produced three books each. At U. N. C. three of the faculty members in the sample have produced one book each, and one other faculty member has produced two books in the last five years.

In terms of articles, the ten Duke faculty members claimed sixty-three, over half of which were accounted for by two professors. The thirteen U. N. C. professors produced fifty-nine articles, and seven of the seventeen U. N. C. students who responded accounted for twelve articles. None of the sixteen Duke students who responded had published an article.

Of the ten Duke faculty, six accounted for thirteen published conference papers; of the thirteen U. N. C. professors who responded, four produced a total of six conference papers. While none of the sixteen Duke students had published a conference paper, two of the seventeen U. N. C. student respondents had published a total of two.

Of the ten Duke faculty seven produced a total of fifty-one book reviews, thirty-five of which were accounted for by two professors. Of the thirteen U. N. C. faculty eleven of them accounted for twenty-seven book reviews. None of the thirty-three student respondents had published a book review in the last five years.

In the category of "other published items" one of the sixteen Duke students had produced a record and a film. One of the U. N. C. professors edited a major journal,[5] another edits an annual catalog of U. N. C. research activity, and another had produced two published comments. One U. N. C. student had published his M.A. thesis, another had published a "short essay," and a third U. N. C. student had published an appendix in a book.

TABLE 8

PUBLISHED ITEMS (1968-1973)

	Duke		U. N. C.		Totals
	Fac.	Grads	Fac.	Grads	
Books	10	0	5	1	16
Articles	63	0	59	12	134
Conf. Papers	13	0	6	2	21
Book Reviews	51	0	27	0	78
Other Pub. Items	0	2	4	3	9
Totals	137	2	101	18	258

During the past five years the two departments produced

---

[5]Although editing a journal is not really "producing an item" in the same sense as editing a book, it nevertheless, requires considerable time and creative effort.

258 items,[6] 238 of which were published by the 23 faculty members. Duke's total was heavily weighted by prodigious publishing efforts of two professors, while U. N. C.'s totals were more evenly divided between faculty members of the department. These results obviously demonstrate a substantial amount of publishing, but comparison with Amsden's data is quite surprising. The Duke and U. N. C. faculty members together produced a ratio of 10.3 items per person, while Amsden's 76 professionals produced 1339 published items, or a ratio of 17.6 items per person over a five-year period.[7]

It is difficult to understand how Amsden's anthropologists could have been so much more prolific. If we accept that there are more anthropological works published in the early 1970's than in the early 1960's, one might expect to find a proportionately lower amount of total publishing in Amsden's survey. It is true that the Duke and U. N. C. faculties are less experienced (in terms of years since the doctorate was earned; see Table 6). Beyond this, other explanations are not clear from the data gathered in this study.

Foreign Language Usage

This question asked, "What foreign languages do you read adequately for your anthropological research interests?

---

[6]It should be added that in-press items were counted in the totals.

[7]Amsden, "Information Problems of Anthropologists," p. 124.

TABLE 9

FOREIGN LANGUAGE USAGE

	Duke			U. N. C.			Total		
	F[a]	G	T	F	G	T	F	G	T
Chinese	1		1				1		1
Danish					2	2		2	2
Dutch				1	1	2	1	1	2
French	8	12	20	7	15	22	15	27	42
German	5	8	13	5	10	15	10	18	28
Greek		1	1					1	1
Hindi	1		1				1		1
Italian	2	1	3		2	2	2	3	5
Japanese	1		1				1		1
Latin				1	1	2	1	1	2
Marathi	1		1				1		1
Norwegian					2	2		2	2
Portuguese		1	1					1	1
Russian		2	2		1	1		3	3
Spanish	3	2	5	5	9	14	8	11	19
Swahili	1		1				1		1
Swedish					2	2		2	2
Turkish	1		1				1		1
Total	24	27	51	19	45	64	43	72	115
None	1		1	2	1	3	3	1	4
Total	25	27	52	21	46	67	46	73	119
n=			27			34			61

[a]F=faculty members, G=graduate students, T=total.

Please list." Sixty-one respondents reported knowledge of eighteen different foreign languages (see Table 9). Only four of the subjects stated that they knew no foreign language adequately, while the other fifty-seven respondents mentioned a total of 115 foreign languages (1.9 foreign languages per respondent). The ratio for Duke was only slightly higher than that for U. N. C. Interestingly enough, the ratio for students was a bare fraction above the ratio for all faculty members.

By far the most popular foreign language was French, and together with German and Spanish, these three languages represented 89 of the 115 cases mentioned (77 per cent). It should also be noted that range of languages mentioned shows a healthy variety. Faculty languages included Chinese, Swahili, Turkish, Hindi, and Dutch, while student languages included a variety of Scandinavian languages, Greek, and Russian.

Amsden's sample of professional anthropologists claimed a reading capacity of between two and three (more towards the higher figure) foreign languages.[8] Her article only mentions the nine most frequently mentioned languages, and for these there are 125 cases. French, German, and Spanish represent 69 per cent of the language cases she lists, but surprisingly enough, there are over twice as many Russian speakers as Spanish speakers in her sample; thus, French, German, and Russian were the top three languages in

---

[8]Amsden, "Information Problems of Anthropologists, p. 125.

her sample, and they accounted for 76 per cent of the language cases she lists. The fact that her sample had a lower proportion of speakers of French, German, and Spanish is possibly due to the fact that twenty-six of her seventy-six respondents (34 per cent) were employed in foreign countries. Since they would probably be less reliant upon languages commonly taught in American schools, they would naturally be expected to have a greater facility in foreign languages and in more unusual foreign languages,[9] as they apparently do.

Ways Used to Gain Information About Anthropology

This question investigated the frequency with which anthropologists used different sources of information, and possibilities included "frequently," "sometimes," and "never." It was expected that the majority of the answers would fall into the "sometimes" category, but the question aimed at determining which sources of information were used frequently or never.[10]

Judging from the results of the "frequently" category (see Table 10), conversation with other anthropologists and footnotes and bibliographies in books are by far the most important sources of information. "Book reviews or publishers'

---

[9]Her sample included five speakers of Afrikaans and three of Japanese.

[10]A few respondents treated the possibilities as a continuum and checked between "sometimes" and "never", and in these cases answers were counted in the closest category.

TABLE 10

WAYS USED TO GAIN INFORMATION ABOUT ANTHROPOLOGY[a]

	Frequently	Sometimes	Never	Total
Conversation with other anthropologists	47	15	1	63
Conversation with non-anthropologists	9	45	8	62
Social gatherings with colleagues	15	38	10	63
Conferences and other formal meetings	9	44	9	62
Visiting speakers	4	56	3	63
Correspondence	8	34	20	62
Prepublication information	6	32	24	62
Non-anthropological literature	18	41	4	63
Library card catalog	14	34	16	64
Indexes and abstracts	12	41	10	63
Footnotes or bibliographies in books	47	16	0	63
Separate or monographic bibliographies	23	33	3	59
Book reviews or publishers' announcements	26	32	4	62
Seminar presentations	9	49	4	62
Other	10	0	0	10

(n=64)

[a]See Tables 21 and 22 in Appendix C for breakdowns by academic status and by university.

announcements" and "separate or monographic bibliographies were also frequently consulted, although the latter category was cited much more frequently by students than by the faculty members (see Table 21 in Appendix C). Seminar presentations were cited as frequently used by nine respondents, all of whom were students. It is interesting that non-anthropological literature and social gatherings with colleagues were cited as more frequently used than the library card catalog. Students used the card catalog much more often than did faculty members; the library card catalog was cited as frequently used by only one faculty member out of twenty-three. This implies that faculty members use the library by browsing and by searching in familiar areas of the stacks.

Visiting speakers were cited as being frequently used by only four people, and all who cited this source were students. Indexes and abstracts were cited as frequently used by only two faculty members, while indexes and abstracts were cited as frequently used by ten students. Conferences were cited as frequently used by six faculty members and only by one graduate student.

A look at the "never" category also proves interesting. Prepublication information, correspondence, the library card catalog, indexes and abstracts, and social gatherings with colleagues were the categories most often cited as never used. Students accounted for eighteen out of twenty of the "never" responses (90 per cent) for correspondence and nineteen out of twenty-four of the "never" responses (79 per cent) for

prepublication information. Students accounted for all nine of the "never" responses for conferences, which is logical because few students can afford to go to conferences. Students also accounted for all three "never" responses for visiting speakers and all four "never" responses for non-anthropological literature. Most remarkable of all, the faculty provided five out of the ten "never" responses (50 per cent) for use of indexes and abstracts and nine out of the sixteen (56 per cent) of the "never" responses for use of the library card catalog.

Differences between Duke and U. N. C. responses were on the whole inconsequential, although U. N. C. faculty members place more emphasis on conversation with other anthropologists than do Duke faculty members. U. N. C. students place less reliance on social gatherings with colleagues than do the Duke students. Duke faculty members also emphasize footnotes and bibliographies in books more than do U. N. C. faculty members.

Amsden's data on this block of questions is not entirely comparable because her question did not provide a category for "never". The Duke-U. N. C. faculty data does, however, agree with her findings in considering conversation with other anthropologists, footnotes or bibliographies in books, and book reviews as the most frequently used sources of information.[11]

---

[11]Actually, Amsden's question had the possibility of "anthropological literature," which was cited by more subjects as frequently used than these three categories; however, these three categories ranked in her top four possibilities.

The Duke-U. N. C. faculty data also supports her finding that indexes, abstracts, and the library card catalog are not used nearly as often as any of the above three sources.

Subject Areas Outside Anthropology

Next, anthropologists were asked to list the subject areas outside of anthropology whose literature they searched.[12] Again, as with Question V on subject areas within anthropology, responses demonstrated a wide range of special interest areas. The fifty-nine respondents cited a total of seventy different topics, which have been grouped together into larger fields in Table 11.

TABLE 11

SUBJECT AREAS OUTSIDE ANTHROPOLOGY[a]

	Duke	U. N. C.	Total
Life Sciences[b]	21	23	44
Physical Sciences	5	4	9
Applied Fields	5	9	14
Social Sciences, Humanities, etc.[c]	40	58	98
Cultural Area Studies	1	4	5
(n=59)	72	98	170

[a]For complete listing see Table 23 in Appendix C. Numbers refer to citations rather than to individuals.

[b]Includes medicine and dentistry.

[c]Includes linguistics.

[12]Subjects were also asked to check the frequency these subject areas were searched, but for most subject areas listed there were very few cases. Even for the ten most frequently listed subject areas, there were so few cases that the frequency data collected was not useful.

TABLE 12

TEN MOST FREQUENTLY CITED SUBJECT AREAS OUTSIDE ANTHROPOLOGY

	Duke F[a]	Duke G	U. N. C. F	U. N. C. G	f	s	Total
Biology[b]	2	2		2	5	1	6
Geography	1		2	3	3	3	6
Geology	2	2		1	2	3	5
History[c]	2	2	2	9	9	6	15
Linguistics	3	3			4	2	6
Medical Literature		1	1	5	5	2	7
Political Science	2	1	1	3	3	4	7
Psychology[d]	4	5	4	6	6	13	19
Sociology[e]		4	3	12	10	9	19
Zoology	2	2		4	5	3	8

(n=59)

[a]F=faculty members, G=graduate students, f=frequently searched, s=sometimes searched.

[b]This category includes evolutionary biology.

[c]This category includes American Colonial, Spanish Colonial, and economic history.

[d]This category includes cognitive psychology and mathematical psychology.

[e]This category includes historical sociology.

From the grouped data on Table 11 there are no significant differences between the two departments, except that U. N. C. respondents place higher emphasis on cultural area studies. From the itemized data in Table 12, however, there are a few differences. U. N. C. anthropologists mentioned the fields of medical literature, history, geography, and sociology significantly more times than did Duke respondents. Duke respondents placed considerably more emphasis on linguistics than did U. N. C. respondents.

Responses were scattered into so many different fields that for individual subject areas themselves, there were few significant differences between faculty and student responses. For the grouped subject areas on Table 11, the one significant difference between faculty and student responses is that all of the responses given for cultural area studies came from faculty members. In addition, Table 12 shows that students are considerably more interested in sociology than are the faculty members.

The Duke-U. N. C. survey results agree with Amsden's results in showing strong connections between anthropology and the humanities and natural sciences. From her data the most frequently searched areas outside of anthropology were history, geography, biology, psychology, geology, zoology, and economics in that order.[13] The ten areas cited

---

[13]Her survey specified twenty-one possible fields instead of asking respondents to list subject areas themselves.

most frequently by the Duke-U. N. C. sample[14] were sociology, psychology, history, zoology, medical literature, political science, linguistics, geography, biology, and geology. Since linguistics and sociology were not included among Amsden's possible answers, the most valuable observation which can be made here is that most of the areas important to Amsden's sample were also important to the Duke and U. N. C. anthropologists.

Hours Spent Per Week Getting Information

This question asked, "How many hours per week do you spend getting information related to your interests as an anthropologist? (This includes time spent gathering information in subject areas outside of anthropology *per se*)." The question was meant to discover the total amount of time the subjects spent in pursuit of anthropology, and it was expected that respondents would include in their estimate time for reading, conversation, classes, library work, and many other means for getting information.

Unfortunately, several of the subjects were confused by the wording of the question, and several commented that it could be interpreted in different ways. One asked if it meant reading the information or finding it. Another said that he could not answer the question because he could not separate thinking and observing from other means of getting

---

[14]It is evident from Table 12 that faculty results rarely amount to more than two responses per category, so a ranking based on faculty responses would not be worthwhile.

TABLE 13

HOURS SPENT PER WEEK GETTING INFORMATION

	Duke		U. N. C.		Total		
	F[a]	G	F	G	F	G	Total
0-9	3	2	6	4	9	6	15
10-19	3	4	4	4	7	8	15
20-29	1	4	2	9	3	13	16
30-39	0	4	0	4	0	8	8
40-49	1	1	0	1	1	2	3
50-59	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
60-over	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
Total	8	17	12	22	20	39	59
No answer	2	0	1	2	3	2	5
Median hrs/wk.	20.7		18.8		11.4	22.1	19.7

[a]F=faculty members, G=graduate students.

information. Those people who thought the question referred only to finding information may have omitted the time spent reading that information, and thus, they may have underestimated the total time they spend in gathering information. Because of these differences in interpretation, the data collected for this question is of uncertain value.

Nonetheless, there were significant differences between the results for faculty members and students. The category most frequently cited by faculty members was 0-9 hours per week, while the category most frequently cited by students was 20-29 hours per week. The faculty members' median estimate was 11.4 hours per week, the students' median estimate was 22.1 hours per week, and the median estimate for the entire sample was 19.7 hours per week. Students claim to spend considerably more time per week than faculty members do in gathering information.

The reason for this may be that students consider class time as time spent gathering information, while some faculty members might not. If a faculty member generally lectures the entire class period, he may seldom gain new information himself, although his students will be gaining information for their needs. Class time, therefore, may bias the results in favor of the students.[15]

One faculty member from Duke commented that the estimate he gave reflected time spent during the academic year and that he spent more time gathering information during the summer. Faculty members from both departments often do much of their original research during summers, when they are teaching fewer courses or no courses at all. Since this survey was administered during the spring, teaching interests far outweighed research in importance. A survey administered in the summer might discover far different estimates of time spent in gathering information.

When the Duke and U. N. C. results are compared for this question, differences are slight. The median estimate of time spent by Duke anthropologists is 20.7 hours per week, while the comparable figure for U. N. C. anthropologists is 18.8 hours per week.

---

[15]Students also in their first two years may take four to five courses, while faculty members generally only teach two or three courses per semester. This effect may be cancelled out by the fact that students may stop taking courses completely after two or three years.

When Amsden asked a similar question[16] of professional anthropologists, she found that the "typical respondent spent ten to nineteen hours per week getting information, the average being twelve hours.[17] Her results, therefore, correspond very closely to the results given by the Duke and U. N. C. faculty members.

Serials

When subjects were asked to list the five periodicals they used most frequently, they cited a wide range of diverse serials. Respondents listed ninety different serial titles, including museum bulletins, newsletters, journals, and popular magazines.[18] The most frequently listed periodicals were American Anthropology, Current Anthropology, Science, Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, American Journal of Physical Anthropology, Nature, Human Organization, American Antiquity, and Language.[19] Although the majority of periodicals listed were cited only once or twice, these nine most frequently cited periodicals account for more than half of the total citations.

---

[16]Personal communication. Hers was worded, "Approximately how many hours per week do you spend obtaining information for your major areas of interest and activities?"

[17]Amsden, "Information Problems of Anthropologists," p. 126.

[18]One student noted that he reads Playboy "to keep tabs on modern U. S. culture."

[19]The faculty listed the first nine journals in the same order, except Language and American Antiquity reverse order in their ranking.

TABLE 14

MOST FREQUENTLY USED PERIODICALS

(BY ENTIRE SAMPLE)

	Duke		U. N. C.		Total
	F[a]	G	F	G	
American Anthropologist	7	15	12	20	54
American Antiquity	0	2	2	5	9
American Journal of Physical Anthropology	4	4	1	4	13
Current Anthropology	2	10	8	18	38
Human Organization	0	0	3	6	9
Language	2	3	1	1	7
Nature	4	5	0	1	10
Science	3	4	5	5	17
Southwestern Journal of Anthropology	1	5	4	7	17
Total	23	48	36	67	174

(n=64)

[a]F=faculty members, G=graduate students.

Differences between U. N. C. and Duke anthropologists are generally insignificant, although U. N. C. respondents cited Human Organization considerably more often than did Duke respondents. This would indicate a stronger interest in applied anthropology at U. N. C.[20] Also, the Duke faculty appears to rely less on Current Anthropology than does the U. N. C. faculty. Nature, the British journal which publishes many articles on physical anthropology and fossils, was cited far more often by the Duke respondents than by the U. N. C. respondents.

[20]Interest in medical literature, another indicator of interest in applied anthropology, was also stronger at U. N. C., as shown in Table 12.

Differences between faculty members and students are even more negligible; both tend to cite popular and highly specialized journals, and both use the same major journals with fairly similar frequencies.

Comparison with Amsden's data demonstrates the widespread use of a small number of core journals. Her respondents most used journals were Current Anthropology, American Anthropologist, Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, Science, Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland Journal, Scientific American, and Man.[21] Although few anthropologists from Duke or U. N. C. cited these last three journals, both Amsden's sample and the Duke and U. N. C. respondents agreed on the four most important journals.

Number of Periodicals Subscriptions

Table 15 summarizes the numbers of anthropological journals which were cited and subscribed to by Duke and U. N. C. respondents. Although differences between Duke and U. N. C. were insignificant, there were substantial differences between faculty members and students. Clearly, graduate students place heavy reliance on the library for supplying periodicals, since twenty-five of the forty graduate students (63 per cent.) subscribed to one or less. Faculty members place comparatively little reliance on the library for supplying the most

---

[21]The fifth and seventh of these had merged before Amsden's article was written. Perhaps, these British journals were cited more frequently by her sample because her sample included twenty-six anthropologists employed outside of America.

TABLE 15

NUMBER OF PERIODICALS SUBSCRIPTIONS

	Duke		U. N. C.		Total		
	F	G	F	G	F	G	Total
None	0	7	1	5	1	12	13
1	2	5	0	8	2	13	15
2	2	2	1	5	3	7	10
3	0	2	2	5	2	7	9
4	1	0	3	1	4	1	5
5	5	0	5	0	10	0	10
n	10	16	12	24	22	40	62

important periodicals, since fourteen of the twenty-two faculty members (64 per cent) subscribed to four or five of the five most frequently used periodicals. This is one of the most striking findings of this survey because it indicates two sharply different patterns of library usage. While students rely on the library for almost all periodicals, faculty members only have to rely on the library for more specialized and less commonly used journals.

Amsden's survey posed this question in a different manner, and her results showed professional anthropologists placing heavy reliance on library subscriptions for periodicals and other forms of literature. This may be explained because her survey listed eighty-four publications, and the respondent could check as many as he used. Since her respondents were not limited to five, they checked considerably more and included more specialized publications which were library subscriptions. Her results indicate that professional anthropologists use a wide variety of publications, regardless of the frequency with which they are used. Her results agreed

with the Duke and U. N. C. results in showing that major journals used by professional anthropologists are far more often personal subscriptions than library subscription.

Abstracting and Indexing Services

Abstracting and indexing services were seldom used by U. N. C. and Duke respondents, and answers indicated that many of the respondents were uncertain about what abstracting and indexing services really are. Twenty of the sixty-four subjects did not respond at all, and another eleven answered that they did not use abstracting or indexing services; thus, only half of the subjects claimed to use any abstracting and indexing services at all. Forty-four respondents listed only twenty-nine different titles, none of which was mentioned more than five times. Out of all cases cited less than half were mentioned as frequently used. The most frequently cited titles were Biological Abstracts and the International Index to the Social Sciences. Results are shown in Table 25.

Neither students nor faculty members made much use of these reference tools. Titles were cited so few times that there were no major differences between faculty and students. Similarly, differences between U. N. C. and Duke anthropologists were not significant. Even very expensive and useful tools such as the Peabody Museum Catalog of Harvard's anthropology collection were seldom used. Ironically, the one person who used Duke University's copy of the Peabody Museum Catalog was a U. N. C. student, who used it frequently.[22]

---

[22]In the process of interviewing it was learned that a U. N. C. professor also uses it frequently.

Responses to this question indicated that anthropologists place little importance on indexes and abstracts, and so did Amsden's survey results. Unfortunately, none of these questions reveal why anthropologists bypass these resources. Either the available services are not up-to-date enough or accurate enough, or else the anthropologists do not know what services are available or how to use them.

Importance of Forms of Literature and Ease of Success in Their Use

This question investigated the importance of eighteen different forms of literature and the ease with which they are used. A small number of respondents commented that they did not know how to judge the "ease of success in use." Some forms of information, e.g., technical reports, may be difficult to use because of problems in access; others, such as foreign publications, may be difficult because of language problems.

For the total sample American journals and all monographs proved to be the most important categories, far surpassing the next most important category "advanced (grad) texts." Encyclopedias, government publications, handbooks, international organization publications, and the Human Relations Area Files were cited least frequently as being of great importance. Remarkably, the Human Relations Area Files, which are available at U. N. C. at Chapel Hill, were described as being of little importance more often than any other form of literature.

TABLE 16

IMPORTANCE OF FORMS OF LITERATURE AND EASE OF SUCCESS IN THEIR USE[a]

	Importance[b]				Ease			
	G	M	L	T	E	M	D	T
Elementary (undergrad) texts	7	18	34	59	39	11	2	52
Advanced (grad) texts	19	32	9	60	32	17	3	52
All monographs	34	21	6	61	25	25	4	54
Foreign monographs	11	16	23	55	10	15	19	44
American journals	48	13	2	63	39	14	2	55
Foreign journals	13	26	18	57	12	22	15	49
Review publications	10	27	19	56	25	18	4	47
Government publications	3	16	39	58	13	15	16	44
International organization publications	4	27	24	55	12	22	7	41
Technical reports	5	22	26	53	8	21	14	43
Encyclopedias[c]	1	8	34	43	32	6	3	41
Dictionaries and glossaries[d]	15	23	24	62	35	5	3	43
Handbooks[d]	5	20	26	51	21	15	4	40
Master's theses, manuscripts, and other unpublished material[e]	13	14	32	59	12	15	21	48
Doctoral dissertations[e]	13	21	25	59	13	15	19	47
Newspapers[d]	5	15	34	54	22	11	6	39
Maps	14	21	20	55	19	15	10	44
Human Relations Area Files[f]	4	10	40	54	12	13	13	38

[a]For breakdowns by academic status and by university, see Tables 26-29 in Appendix C.

[b]G=great, M=moderate, L=little, E=easy, D=difficult, T=total.

[c]One respondent answered "not applicable," and one answered "never consulted."

[d]One respondent answered "not applicable."

[e]One respondent answered "never consulted."

[f]Two respondents answered "never consulted," and one implied "not applicable."

The sources of information which were most difficult to use were "master's theses, manuscripts, and other unpublished material," doctoral dissertations, foreign monographs, government publications,[23] foreign journals, technical reports, and the Human Relations Area Files in that order. The forms of information which were easiest to use were American journals, elementary texts, dictionaries and glossaries, encyclopedias, and advanced texts.

Overall, there was no direct relationship between the most important and easiest to use sources. American journals were both easy to use and the most important form of literature; yet, dictionaries, glossaries, and encyclopedias were easy to use, while being of little importance. It is possible, however, that there is a more direct relationship between those sources listed as being both difficult to use and of little importance.

The difficulties in using government reports, international organization publications, and technical reports may be largely a problem of finding them, since these are often segregated and organized by government document classification systems; ignorance of what is in these sources may be the reason they are considered of little importance. Master's theses and doctoral dissertations may often be

---

[23] In a 1962 citation analysis study, Jean B. Lord found that government documents are seldom used by anthropologists ("The Use of United States Government Publications as Research Literature in Anthropology," American Anthropologist, LXVI (February, 1964), 132-34.) The fact that these documents are difficult to use likely accounts for the little use anthropologists make of them.

difficult to find, unavailable, or only available on microfilm, and difficulties in access may account for their relative unimportance in the perception of these anthropologists.

There were major differences between student and faculty members' use of these forms of information. Students valued foreign monographs and journals far less than did the faculty members, and students made proportionately more use of the Human Relations Area Files than did faculty members. Elementary texts were only cited as being of great importance by students, and students also placed higher emphasis on advanced texts than did faculty members. Faculty members valued review publications and newspapers proportionately higher than did students.

Students had more difficulty than faculty members in using many of these forms of information: particularly all monographs, foreign monographs, foreign journals, review publications, technical reports, master's theses, doctoral dissertations, and maps. The sharp differences between students and faculty members (see Tables 26 and 27 in Appendix C) lead one to believe that factors of comprehension affected this question. If a student had difficulty understanding information found in these sources, he conceivably would find them more difficult to use than a faculty member would, regardless of problems of access. Any future survey should separate problems of comprehension from problems of access in using these materials.

There were also several differences between the Duke

and U. N. C. departments. Duke's department relied more on foreign journals, dictionaries and glossaries, newspapers, and maps than did the U. N. C. department. U. N. C. anthropologists also valued doctoral dissertations, master's theses, and the Human Relations Area Files slightly higher than did the Duke anthropologists; yet, these three differences are surprisingly minor.[24]

The two departments were generally in agreement about which forms of literature were easy to use. Duke anthropologists did find newspapers and maps easier to use than did U. N. C. respondents, but U. N. C. anthropologists found government documents and technical reports easier to use than did Duke respondents. Whether this reflects on the organization of their respective libraries or on differences in experience using these forms of literature, it is impossible to tell from the survey data.[25]

The Duke-U. N. C. results correlate very well with Amsden's main findings. She found "journals publishing papers of original research" and "all monographs" to be the most important types of anthropological literature. She also found lack of accessibility to be a problem in obtaining

---

[24]U. N. C. maintains a substantial collection of master's theses in its departmental office, while Duke does not. Also, the Human Relations Area Files are located at U. N. C., and one would thus expect more anthropologists there to value them highly.

[25]Questions on ease of success in use were not answered by ten to twenty subjects, which might indicate that several subjects had not used all of the forms of literature listed. Only four respondents wrote that they had not used particular forms of literature.

"foreign materials, masters theses, and other unpublished material, doctoral dissertations in particular."[26] Differences between the Duke-U. N. C. results and Amsden's results were meager, although Amsden's sample emphasized the importance of foreign journals and encyclopedias more than the Duke-U. N. C. sample, and they also found the Human Relations Area Files more easy to use than did the Duke-U. N. C. sample.

Importance of Library Services

Table 17 summarizes the importance of eleven types of library services for Duke and U. N. C. anthropologists' needs. Since not all of these services are available, the question was used to find which services would possibly be important for the respondents.[27] For the entire sample of Duke and U. N. C. anthropologists, the most useful services would be loans and photocopies supplied, comprehensive literature searches (e.g., bibliographies), critical surveys of the literature, and guidance by the library staff.

For the future most respondents felt they would need more loans and photocopies.[28] They also wanted other services such as brief literature searches and quick reference service in the future. Although a large number of anthropologists

---

[26]Amsden, "Information Problems of Anthropologists," p. 126.

[27]The question asked, "What is the importance of library services for your information needs? (Please assume that these services are available)."

[28]One respondent asked for photocopies at a less expensive rate.

TABLE 17

IMPORTANCE OF LIBRARY SERVICES[a]

	Now					Future			
	S[b]	V	N1	N2	T	Y	N3	N2	T
Loans and photocopies supplied	25	31	1		57	36	1		37
Quick reference service, e.g., telephone	35	10	4		59	19	1		20
Brief literature search	26	20	4		50	19	1		20
Comprehensive literature search, e.g., bibliography	24	23	4		51	16	4		20
Critical survey of literature	17	21	4	1	43	10	3	1	14
Translations	29	12	5		46	15	2		17
Abstracts of specified articles	30	15	4		49	13	2		15
Editorial assistance, e.g., proofreading	28	6	4	1	39	4	3	1	8
Help in location of audio-visual materials	30	8	3	2	43	9	1	1	11
Guidance by library staff	32	18			50	8	1	1	10
Library accession lists	25	15	2		42	11	2		13

(n=64)

[a]For breakdowns by academic status and by university, see Tables 30-33 in Appendix C.

[b]S=sometimes important, V=very important, N1=never important or never utilized, N2=not applicable, T=total, Y=yes, N3=no.

saw comprehensive literature searches and critical surveys of the literature as valuable now, far fewer respondents said they would need more of them in the future. A few people reacted strongly to this question and wrote that they would never want someone else to survey the literature for them because they felt no one else could do it for them.

Although one might expect that students would want critical surveys of the literature more than faculty members, this is not the case; they value this service approximately equally. Students do place a much higher value on comprehensive literature searches than do the faculty members, and they also place a higher value on library accession lists and loans and photocopies. For the future students also desire quick reference service and brief literature searches more than do the faculty members.

Differences between Duke and U. N. C. respondents were in most cases insignificant. Duke anthropologists more frequently wrote that particular services were "never important" or "never consulted" at present; U. N. C. respondents more often wrote particular services would not be needed more in the future. Duke anthropologists stressed the importance of help in locating audiovisual materials more so than the U. N. C. respondents; this may be partially due to the lack of a centralized film bureau at Duke University.[29] More

---

[29]U. N. C. has one centralized office where one can rent, or receive films on loan. At Duke University each department purchases, rents, or borrows films independently.

U. N. C. respondents believed that translations would be more important in the future than did Duke respondents, and perhaps, this implies U. N. C. anthropologists intend to use more foreign publications than do Duke anthropologists. A larger number of Duke respondents than U. N. C. respondents felt that guidance by the library staff would be more necessary in the future.

Amsden's results differed somewhat, although her sample likewise appreciated loans and photocopies far more than the other possible services. "Library accession lists, guidance by the library staff, quick reference services, bibliography compilation, and location of audio-visual materials" were next in importance for current needs. The services desired most by her sample were "bibliography compilation, brief literature search, continuous literature scanning, translation, and abstracting."[30]

Problems in Gathering Information

The last block of questions on the survey investigated the frequency with which anthropologists experience seventeen types of problems in gathering information.[31] For the entire Duke and U. N. C. sample the most critical problems were not

---

[30]There were many missing answers from the Duke and U. N. C. faculty members, so comparison with Amsden's data was of little value. Amsden, "Information Problems of Anthropologists," p. 130.

[31]Possibilities included "frequently," "sometimes," and "never." One who never experiences a problem, such as finding indexing unsatisfactory, may possibly never use indexing services; thus, a "never" response implies only that the respondent has not yet experienced that problem.

TABLE 18

PROBLEMS IN GATHERING INFORMATION[a]

	F[b]	S	N	Total
Not knowing where to go for information	7	50	4	61
Incomplete coverage by index and abstracting services	19	36	5	60
Unsatisfactory indexing by indexing and abstracting services	18	33	7	58
Inadequate or insufficient help from library staff	4	32	26	62
Inadequate cataloging of library materials	19	35	5	59
Difficulty in obtaining foreign publications	13	33	10	56
Difficulty in obtaining unpublished material	30	18	11	59
Difficulty in obtaining technical reports	8	22	20	50
Not enough copies of some material	32	21	6	59
Published information in your area of specialization is inadequate	20	30	5	55
Library collections in your area of specialization are inadequately organized	26	19	12	57
Information published is not up-to-date	25	23	9	57
Information available is not up-to-date	26	23	7	56
Difficulty in locating material listed in card catalog	17	28	15	60
Library collections in your home university are too scattered	26	18	14	58
Library collections in your home university are inadequate	22	26	9	57
Library collections in the Triangle Region are inadequate	11	23	18	52

(n=64)

[a]For breakdowns by academic status and by university, see Tables 34-37 in Appendix C.

[b]F=frequently, S=sometimes, N=never experienced.

finding enough copies of some material, experiencing difficulties in obtaining unpublished materials, finding that library collections were inadequately organized and too scattered, and finding that the information available was not up-to-date.

Although inadequacy of collections was the major complaint listed by Amsden's anthropologists, this problem ranked only as seventh most important by the Duke and U. N. C. sample, a fact which indicates relative satisfaction with the collection at the two universities. Scattering of materials was the second most important problem Amsden discovered, and that also appears to be a major drawback of the Duke and U. N. C. libraries.

Possibilities which the Duke and U. N. C. anthropologists cited most often as never being problems include inadequate or insufficient help from library staff, difficulties in obtaining technical reports, and finding the library collections in the Triangle Region to be inadequate. The latter two possibilities are probably not problems because the respondents make limited use of these resources; the first was likely not a problem because of relative contentment with the help already given by library staff members. Several faculty members who were interviewed commented favorably on the assistance they had received from librarians, so apparently, lack of staff help is a relatively minute difficulty. Amsden also found this to be the case.

Amsden ascertained that inadequate cataloging was her

sample's third most important problem; yet, this problem was only of medium importance for the entire Duke and U. N. C. sample. The Duke and U. N. C. faculty members, however, ranked cataloging in the top four most important problems, along with not enough copies, information published not being up-to-date, and library collections being too scattered. The difference between Amsden's and the Duke-U. N. C. results on cataloging is that students are far less aware of problems of inadequate cataloging than are faculty members.

Students' problems are generally very similar to those of faculty members; students' greatest problems are not finding enough copies, difficulties in obtaining unpublished materials, library collections being inadequately organized, and information available not being up-to-date. The second and fourth of these are only partly the problems of the library and partly the problems of the discipline and the publishing industry.

Differences between Duke and U. N. C. respondents were also generally insignificant; however, Duke anthropologists more often complained about not having enough copies and about their library collections being too scattered.[32] The latter finding is extremely surprising because U. N. C.'s library system is far more decentralized than Duke's is. Duke's book collection is classified completely in the Dewey Decimal system, while U. N. C.'s collection is divided between the

---

[32]See Tables 36 and 37 in Appendix C.

Dewey Decimal system and the Library of Congress classification system. Furthermore, U. N. C. has between three and four times as many departmental libraries as Duke. Clearly, more research is necessary to find out why U. N. C. anthropologists are more content with their more divided collections.

Summary of Conclusions

In sum, the results of the survey show that:

1. The Duke and U. N. C. faculty were somewhat less experienced than Amsden's sample; yet, the Duke and U. N. C. sample demonstrated interests in a wide variety of subject areas within and outside of the broad spectrum of anthropology. They usually identified their interest areas within anthropology in relatively specialized, precise terms, rather than in very broad terms such as "physical anthropology." Faculty members ordinarily lacked any assistance in doing their own library work. Teaching was their main preoccupation, while reading, studying, and classwork were the main time-consuming activities of students. Although both departments produce considerable amounts of publications, neither faculty produces as much proportionately as did Amsden's sample. The Duke and U. N. C. anthropologists generally read adequately well in two foreign languages.

2. The Duke and U. N. C. faculty members, like the Amsden sample, place greatest emphasis on conversation with other anthropologists, footnotes or bibliographies in books, and book reviews as the most important sources of information. Conversation with other anthropologists and footnotes or bibliographies in books were also the most important sources of information for students.[33]

3. Faculty members spend an average of between ten and twenty hours per week in getting information related to their interests as anthropologists, while students average between twenty and thirty hours per week.

---

[33]Anthropology classes were not one of the possible categories for this question, so students likely considered classroom information as coming through conversation.

4. Both students and faculty members make use of a wide variety of periodicals; yet, neither group makes extensive use of abstracting and indexing services. Faculty members usually subscribe to the journals which are most important to them.

5. Of the forms of literature American journals surpassed all monographs in importance, and many forms of literature, such as government publications, foreign monographs, etc. were found to be of particularly low importance by both Duke and U. N. C. anthropologists. Master's theses, doctoral dissertations, foreign monographs, and government publications were the most difficult forms of literature to use.

6. The library services which are considered most useful by the Duke and U. N. C. anthropologists now are loans and photocopies supplied, comprehensive literature searches (such as bibliographies), critical surveys of the literature, and guidance by the library staff. For their future needs the Duke and U. N. C. anthropologists consider loans and photocopies supplied to be the most important library services.

7. The most severe information retrieval problems cited by the Duke and U. N. C. anthropologists were not finding enough copies of some material, experiencing difficulties in obtaining unpublished materials, finding that library collections were too scattered, and finding that the information available was not up-to-date. Both departments are relatively satisfied with their respective library's collections, when compared to the dissatisfaction Amsden found in her survey.

8. Differences between faculty and students and between Duke and U. N. C. do exist in many small areas; however, on the whole, similarities are more striking than the differences between these pairs. Differences between the faculty members and Amsden's professional anthropologists are also relatively small.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVIEW DATA

In the spring and early summer of 1973, twenty faculty members from the two universities were interviewed, in order to gather further information on library use and information needs.[1] The sample represents nine of eleven faculty members in residence at Duke (88 per cent) and eleven of the twenty-two faculty members in residence at U. N. C. (50 per cent). The composition of the sample by field of specialization is shown in Table 19.

TABLE 19

COMPOSITION OF THE SAMPLE

(BY FIELD OF SPECIALIZATION)

	Duke	U. N. C.	Total
Applied Fields	0	1	1
Archeology	1	1	2
Ethnobotany	0	1	1
Linguistics	2	2[a]	4
Physical anthropology	2	2	4
Sociocultural and related varieties of anthropology	4	4	8
Total	9	11	20

[a]Includes one member of the Linguistics Department whose courses are cross-listed with anthropology.

[1]With two exceptions interviews were taped.

Interviewees' Reactions to the Survey

Four of the interviewees commented that many of the survey questions were not relevant to their use of the library. Other interviewees found that some questions were difficult to answer because they had not had experience with certain forms of literature and because they simply did not use the library frequently. Only three volunteered the opinion that the survey was valuable and a good idea. Five did not remember the survey well because of the time which had elapsed between the survey and interview period and also because they were so frequently surveyed.

Years of Experience with the Respective Library System

The faculty members interviewed had used their respective library systems for an average of eight years. Although ten interviewees had had less than six years of experience, five had used their libraries for over fifteen years each. The sample was therefore diverse, including professors with less than a year's experience and those who had had up to twenty-seven year's experience.

Extent of Satisfaction with Collections

The great majority of the faculty members interviewed found the collections in their special interest areas to be quite good. Often the interviewees commented that they almost never have trouble in getting what they need, although in a few cases this may require a last minute rush order for a book to be placed on reserve. Duke anthropologists were

somewhat more enthusiastic than were those from U. N. C.: one Duke professor volunteered that he was "quite surprised at how good the collections are."

Only four professors out of twenty expressed significant discontent with the collections, and three of these cases resulted from lack of past faculty interest in their specialty areas. Three of these professors teach at U. N. C., and one of these was considerably less severe than the other two; his opinion was that the U. N. C. anthropology collections were "OK," but he just "doesn't expect miracles" in finding esoteric items. One U. N. C. professor was well aware of financial restrictions which prevented his library from buying expensive reprint sets of Spanish language materials and well aware of difficulties inherent in acquiring out-of-print Latin American publications. Another U. N. C. professor qualified his criticism by saying, "I haven't really got any serious criticisms of this library system over any other one. I find these same kinds of problems everywhere." Still, these four faculty members found substantial gaps while searching for library materials in their specialty areas.

When asked about specific forms of library materials, sixteen out of the twenty interviewees (80 per cent) found both book and periodicals collections to be adequate or better. Subjects, however, often mentioned that they wished their library had a few more periodicals which they specially needed.

When asked to judge their library's collection of

monographic bibliographies, indexes, abstracting services, and newsletters, interviewees generally side-stepped the question and mentioned specific titles that they had used. A few commented that they seldom used monographic bibliographies because these either were not up-to-date enough, not available, inaccurate, or else they contained too many irrelevant citations. The majority of anthropologists admitted that they rarely or never used indexes. Only two said they used indexes heavily. Two professors were not familiar with the Social Sciences and Humanities Index. One faculty member reasoned that he seldom used indexes because he already knew the literature well. Abstracting services were also infrequently used. One professor stated bluntly that there were no abstracting services specifically for anthropology. Only four people (20 per cent) mentioned knowledge of Abstracts in Anthropology, only two mentioned actually having used them, and one of these said that they were not valuable for him. Several others had never heard of Abstracts in Anthropology.[2]

Newsletters were almost universally described as unimportant, and none of the twenty interviewees used them in the library. Several anthropologists complained that newsletters were nothing but trade gossip, grantsmanship, and "political hassles," and because of this one observed that newsletters were of far more benefit to graduate students than to faculty members.

---

[2]This publication has been in existence since 1970 and is available at both university libraries.

In sum, the interviewees found the Duke and U. N. C. library collections to be adequate overall. They generally found book and periodicals collections to be sufficient. They were, however, unable to evaluate the adequacy of library holdings in monographic bibliographies, indexes, abstracting services, and newsletters because they seldom used these sources.

Use of Resources Outside of the Home Universities

When asked if they felt they were making the best use of resources available in the Triangle Region of North Carolina, the interviewees responded almost unanimously that they were not. One Duke faculty member commented that he was possibly not making the best use of Triangle Region resources but that he felt overwhelmed by Duke's own resources. Only one of the twenty interviewees had been to North Carolina State University's library. Reasons given included, "inconvenient and too lazy," "too damn far to go," "not enough time," and similar responses. These results are extremely surprising considering the relatively long time several of the interviewees have been living in the area.

Considering only U. N. C. and Duke's libraries, eleven of the twenty faculty members (55 per cent) have never been to the library of the neighboring university. Three Duke faculty members use U. N. C.'s library occasionally, and only one uses it "fairly regularly." Three U. N. C. faculty members use Duke's library occasionally, one has not used it in ten years, and one uses it frequently. On the

whole, faculty members make little direct use of the other libraries in the Triangle Region.

On the other hand, all but two of the faculty members had made use of interlibrary loan at their home universities. Two U. N. C. faculty members had not used it themselves, but students working for them had used it. Only five of the interviewees (25 per cent) use interlibrary loan frequently, while the others use it sporadically or seldom. Few interviewees volunteered comments on the quality of interlibrary loan service, but for those who did, reaction was mixed at both universities. For example, Duke faculty members' opinions ranged from "It doesn't work at all" to "absolutely first-rate!" This service, however, did prove useful to many faculty members, and as one U. N. C. professor commented, the reason he did not drive to Duke's or N. C. S. U.'s libraries was because it was much easier to use interlibrary loan.

Orientation of Information Needs

When asked if their use of the literature was more theoretically oriented or more geographically oriented, ten anthropologists answered that their work was more theoretically oriented, and only one U. N. C. professor said that his work was more geographically oriented at present. The remaining nine interviewees answered that their interests were equally divided between theoretical and geographical interest areas. Differences between Duke and U. N. C. responses were negligible, even though in the survey sample the U. N. C. department had shown a heavier emphasis on cultural area studies.

Part of the rationale for this question was to see if this factor might affect use of the Human Relations Area Files. The card files available at U. N. C. are organized first by geographic and cultural areas and only secondly by theoretical topics. Therefore, a person interested in everything related to East Africa would only have to use a limited section of the files, while a person interested in a particular theoretical topic would have to locate the correct drawer in every relevant section of the files. In this sense, one would expect the card files to be easier to use and, perhaps, to be more heavily used by those anthropologists who were cultural area specialists. One might also have expected more U. N. C. professors to consider the HRAF important, simply because it is located at their university. As we have seen (Tables 16 and 26 to 29), there was little difference in the U. N. C. and Duke evaluations of the HRAF. The high emphasis on theoretical concerns expressed by the interviewees may be part of the reason why anthropologists at both universities make little use of the HRAF.[3]

---

[3]This is not to say that the HRAF cannot be used for theoretical formulations. It has frequently been used in that way for cross-cultural studies; nevertheless, it is a time-consuming process to search through large numbers of drawers. The information coded for the Ethnographic Atlas and other information already coded for computer retrieval makes the computer a relatively faster way to use HRAF data. There are other problems with U. N. C.'s HRAF, including filing backlogs and cramped quarters. These problems and the relationship between usage and general information retrieval orientation require further investigation. Not every sociocultural anthropologist is interested in cross-cultural research, and at U. N. C. the heaviest users of the HRAF are members of the Sociology, Psychology, and Public Health departments.

Interviewees were next asked how their information needs had changed over the last few years, in order to determine any patterns which might affect library usage. Four felt that their needs had changed very greatly, eight believed that their needs had changed somewhat, while eight anthropologists' needs had changed very little or not at all. Although it would serve little purpose to list all of the individual changes in interest areas, the variety of responses was most interesting, and several of the comments were enlightening.

According to one young U. N. C. faculty member, there is a major change in information needs between the time one is a graduate student and the time one becomes a professional. In his opinion, the graduate student requires the classic statements of anthropological problems, while the professional most needs the current, up-to-date statement. Although this would not hold true for those faculty members involved in historical research, it does seem to be a productive generalization which will bear further investigation.

Another professor believed that her information needs changed in a cyclical pattern governed by which stage of research or teaching she happened to be in. In beginning to teach a topic, she would make use of elementary texts. In beginning a new research topic, she would normally refer to more specialized papers in the field. If periods of teaching alternate with periods of research, then changes in one's information needs become more cyclical than progressive.

There also may be a great change in information usage between the time an anthropologist takes on his first faculty position and several years thereafter. When one faculty member first arrived at U. N. C., he needed to finish his dissertation, which required one set of specialized information. At the same time he was beginning to teach beginning anthropology courses, so he needed to expand his factual knowledge in a broad range of areas. Now, his interests revolve around more theoretical topics, and he finds interaction with other faculty members to be most fruitful in satisfying his information needs.

This question was set in the context of how changes in anthropological information needs would affect the library. Almost all felt that changes in their information needs would be reflected in the book orders they request from time to time. Only one of the individual faculty members felt that changes in his personal needs would require an extraordinarily large investment in library resources, and this particular professor did not feel he was justified in making such demands on the U. N. C. library. Most interesting of all, the vast majority of faculty members implied that their own actions, changing their own book order requests, would be all that would be required for the library to respond to their individual needs. Only a very small proportion of the interviewees revealed that they realized librarians select and order books independent of faculty requests. Almost none saw any reason to inform librarians verbally when their subject interests did change.

Interviewees were also asked if they saw a change in the orientation of their department, and they found this a particularly difficult question to answer. The majority at both universities did not see a particular departmental orientation; they felt that the departments were no more than the sum total of individual faculty members. When a faculty member leaves or when a new one arrives, then the department changes. Duke's department will soon be gaining a new chairwoman, and one professor at Duke suggested that this might make a slight change, but Duke faculty members generally saw their department as an eclectic collection of individuals. One Duke professor commented that the only fundamental change in its orientation was the addition of an archeologist for the first time this past year. One Duke professor and three at U. N. C. believed that their departments were shifting more towards applied fields, but these were the only ones in the sample to see a change in departmental orientation. Since the field is still extremely eclectic, libraries will have to continue acquiring materials in a myriad of different subfields within the broad spectrum of anthropology.

Library Research in Relation to Field Work

Anthropologists were asked if they thought library research would become more important in relation to field work as time goes on, and opinions were very much divided on this question. The field experience and the process of participant observation have traditionally been seen as distinctive trademarks of social anthropology, and anthropologists

still see fieldwork as important in preventing ethnocentricity and in teaching the student how to do social research in foreign cultures. The interviewees take this position, and linguists, archeologists, and physical anthropologists interested in primate behavior all agree that fieldwork is extremely important.

Nonetheless, today there are at least three difficulties in arranging field work in the so-called "primitive" cultures: acculturation, political problems, and financial problems. As Western culture spreads around the globe, the folk cultures traditionally studied by anthropologists become increasingly integrated into the urbanized, Westernized world culture, and this makes holistic studies of primitive culture increasingly difficult. Many of these folk cultures are also located in Third World countries increasingly hostile to the United States and to anthropologists in general. In the 1960's the Project Camelot scandal in South America implicated anthropologists in research on subversive activity, and since then, more and more countries have begun to doubt the intentions of anthropologists. Consequently, more and more countries are closing their doors to anthropological research. Also, federal and foundation money, which in recent years has been the source of funding for most anthropological fieldwork, is decreasing. With less money available for research, anthropologists will have to turn to less expensive areas for research, such as applied work or social research in America, or else they will have to conduct their research on secondary sources in libraries and archives.

Even though the interviewees agreed on the importance of fieldwork, sixteen of the twenty anthropologists (80 per cent) expected that library research would become more important in the future. One specialist in American Indian languages felt that an increase in library research would be inevitable as these Indian languages die out. Others, including two physical anthropologists, answered that it would be inevitable because there is so much literature being produced now that no one has time to read and synthesize it. A few expressed the hope that library research would become more important because they felt no one now is doing enough background research before doing experiments or their own field work; this is a slightly different problem. Nevertheless, the finding that anthropologists expect to be making much more use of the library in the future is a highly significant one, and librarians would do well to take heed of it.

Prepublication Communication

When asked about the importance of prepublication communication, interviewees proved to have several different conceptions of what this term means. Some considered "prepublication communication" to include letters asking questions, conversation at conferences, and all forms of information exchange on a research topic. Others took the term to mean only manuscripts written and passed among friends or papers typed and distributed at conferences, yet never published.

Reactions to prepublication communication were highly variable. Three of the four physical anthropologists said

that the exchange of papers was unimportant, and two were particularly upset by the low quality of these papers. They saw informal conversation, letter writing, and receiving advance papers for editorial review as considerably more important than these papers not intended for publication.

Linguists, on the other hand, thrive on prepublication papers, and all four in the sample commented that these were extremely important. Two noted that they were far more important in linguistics than in sociocultural anthropology. This is partly because linguistics is still a small field in terms of numbers of professionals, and because the number of people knowledgeable in each specialized subfield is very small, it is hard to make publishing financially profitable. According to one Duke linguistic anthropologist, linguists are more prolific than most anthropologists, and so, they have arranged for certain organizations to duplicate and circulate their papers. Ohio University Department of Linguistics, for example, makes these informal papers available; yet, they are difficult for a library to acquire. According to a U. N. C. professor, they may be available only for a short time, and then they may never be available again, or they may not be formally published for up to seven or eight years later. Since it is hard to retrieve these publications, friends form cliques based on subfield interests and often only exchange papers with each other. This appears to be valid for linguistic anthropology as well as for other areas of linguistics.

Of the two archeologists one answered that prepublication

communication was extremely important because it takes five to seven years to have research published. He felt that it was this publication lag that makes meetings, papers, and informal networks so important. For the other archeologist prepublication communication (in the form of papers) was "moderately important," and he wished that it would become "totally unimportant."

Of the other anthropologists six felt that it was extremely important and especially so within narrow interest groups. One answered "between very and moderately important," and only three answered that prepublication communication (in the form of papers) was relatively unimportant. One of these said that it was unimportant for him but that it was very important for the young anthropologist. Although he would not circulate his own papers "unless it was a very special occasion," he felt it was his duty to help out young anthropologists who sent their own papers for his criticism.

In sum, twelve of the twenty anthropologists (60 per cent found prepublication communication to be very important.[4] Although one might expect that those relying heavily on prepublication communication (e.g., linguists) would be less heavy users of the library than those who relied little on

---

[4]This does not correlate very well with faculty members' survey responses for the use of prepublication information, although it agrees well with the survey data which indicated the importance of informal communication between anthropologists. Survey results showed that faculty members used prepublication communication more often than students, but the interview sample of faculty members apparently valued it more than did the survey sample (see Tables 10, 21, and 22).

it (e.g., physical anthropologists), the sample was too small to establish such a pattern.

Field and Lab Notes

It was hypothesized that field and lab notes of other anthropologists would be useful to Duke and U. N. C. anthropologists. Since field notes contain masses of information which are often never published, it was felt useful to determine how often these are exchanged and what role a library should have in acquiring them.

Surprisingly enough, the vast majority of anthropologists had not circulated their own field notes, did not want to, and did not want to see anyone else's field notes. Several answered that if they needed a particular bit of information, they would write to the author, but they would not ask for field notes; publishing someone else's data before he had done it himself would be a form of robbery. Also, most people's notes are idiosyncratic, are written in shorthand, and incorporate abbreviations that are incomprehensible to others without a code. There is also a problem in confidentiality, and some anthropologists are extremely concerned about revealing explicit personal information about informants who may still be alive and whose security may be threatened by the release of such information. A U. N. C. professor said that he wouldn't release his own because they were impressionistic, they included much that was only relevant to his mood at that particular time, and that important nuances would not necessarily make sense to others. Several of the

interviewees made clear that what they found important was the researcher's synthesis of his data, not the raw data itself.

Of the whole sample only one made his notes available to colleagues, one had used others' field notes forty years ago, and one showed hers to graduate students working in her specialty area. At least for field notes of living scholars, these anthropologists make little use of this form of information, and librarians may take this finding into consideration. Collecting field notes of deceased anthropologists may, however, be another matter.[5]

Value of a Hypothetical Newsletter Information Service

It was hypothesized that a frequent newsletter service would be useful in keeping anthropologists up-to-date with the latest research and the latest findings in their fields of interest. When asked about the usefulness of such a service, opinion was widely split. Many had misgivings about newsletters in general because of the trivia and gossip they often contain,[6] but half of the interviewees appreciated particular

---

[5]No question was asked concerning the archival value of field notes in the Duke and U. N. C. libraries, but comments gathered in the interviews seem to imply that few of these anthropologists would use them now. According to the interviewees, the American Philosophical Society and the Smithsonian Institution do have archival collections of field notes. One professor from this sample will probably give his field notes to a university or to such an archive in the future. If future anthropologists do make more use of libraries and archives, then these sources may become more important then.

[6]Some had doubts about how current a newsletter could

newsletters within their specialty areas. One ethnobotanist said that he would be willing to pay a fair amount to keep up-to-date by newsletter, but that there were not enough people working in his specialty area to make a newsletter economically viable. Several regretted the deaths of particular newsletters, and others were hopeful with the birth of others.

One problem appears to be that no newsletter service can keep anthropologists up-to-date with progress in the whole field. Anthropology is simply too large and splintered, and newsletters, as they exist today, usually help reinforce fragmentation, rather than helping to integrate the field. The Duke and U. N. C. anthropologists read the newsletters which they receive on subscription, e.g., the American Anthropological Association Newsletter; yet, not one in twenty mentioned using other newsletters in the library. Many of the interviewees were unfamiliar with newsletters besides one or two within their own specialty area. Librarians, if they continue to store newsletters, could perhaps supply bibliographies of newsletter titles, so that anthropologists would at least know what other publications are available for keeping themselves up-to-date.

---

be. It takes people time to learn information, to send it in to the newsletter, and to publish and mail the newsletter. Journals such as American Antiquity carry current research information, but some of this information may often be a year old at time of publication. Hopefully, a newsletter service could publish information faster.

Computers

Although many of these anthropologists had not given much prior thought to using computers in anthropological information retrieval, they generally felt that some computerized system would be useful for their needs. Their responses had very little in common, but some of their observations are worthy of note.

Three people felt that a computerized bibliography for historical information would be very useful and far more useful than a computerized bibliography of recent publications. As one Duke professor said, it "probably would take the same amount of work to do this from 1850 to 1950 as it would from 1950 to now, and from my standpoint it would be considerably more valuable." For those who use old, obscure, and foreign language publications, flipping through tables of contents is a waste of time, and many obscure sources are not covered in monographic bibliographies. Another felt that by the time a computerized bibliography of recent titles was published, he would already know about the important titles anyway.[7]

Subject headings, which would be crucial for retrieval, were seen as a major problem by a few interviewees. Two found keyword systems to be greatly inadequate for their needs, while three expressed guarded approval for them. Another anthropologist commented that Current Anthropology's keyword system may save time in indexing, but it is not

---

[7]This does not consider the possibilities of on-line retrieval or Selective Dissemination of Information.

really better than other types of indexes for finding things. One liked the HRAF subject headings, while another thought the entire HRAF system was rubbish. It appears that no one system will satisfy everyone.

The interviewees also saw other problems. Any computerized bibliography of adequate scale would cost millions of dollars, and while that would represent a modest sum for the federal government, it would probably be overwhelming for the discipline of anthropology alone. Others felt that there was too much anthropological information to develop an "optimally useful" bibliography, much less a machine-readable equivalent of the Human Relations Area Files. Another person saw difficulties in drawing the boundaries between what is anthropology and what is not. Another wondered how current citations would be entered into the system, i.e., whether they would only include citations to publications compilers received or whether compilers could afford to scour the globe for everything published.

Some saw uses of the computer more for data retrieval than for bibliographic retrieval. One linguist wanted to find all languages lacking nasal consonants, and he would like a computerized system to be able to provide that kind of information. An archeologist was interested in pottery data, and as he made clear, photographs of pottery shards are more useful than elaborate, computer-coded descriptions; in other words, textual materials are more easy to computerize than illustrations, and illustrations are very valuable to archeologists.

When asked about the usefulness of statistical data in a computerized retrieval system, seven (35 per cent) were frankly not interested, six (30 per cent) said it might be useful in an ideal system although not for them, and seven (35 per cent) said it would be useful to them. Those who needed this type of information wanted statistics to answer questions about how many people speak certain languages by ethnic unit, degree of sociocultural complexity, and time depth or questions requiring statistics on seed size or on biometric data on bones and teeth. One stated that he would not trust sociological survey data unless he knew the sampling method used; it would be necessary for any data bank to include information about how the data was gathered.

One person wanted information on where to locate book reviews, and several felt that abstracts would accompany citations in the ideal computerized bibliography.[8] Almost all wanted access to both theoretical and geographic topics. Most important of all, almost everyone wanted citations to books, articles, and all printed information; anthropologists need a master bibliography which would be comprehensive and which would be the final authority.

Miscellaneous Observations, Criticisms and Recommendations

Several of the interviewees offered extended opinions

---

[8]Opinion on abstracts was sharply divided, whenever interviewees expressed an opinion. Six people would include them, while three distrusted them and did not want them in such a computerized system.

and criticisms which are highly relevant to questions of library and literature usage.

Duke interviewees:

1. A few Duke professors were concerned that browsing was difficult in the Duke libraries, and one mentioned that he liked small college libraries because they were easier to browse in and were, therefore, more "usable" than Duke's library.

2. One was highly critical of Duke's policy of not placing order cards in the main catalog when books are ordered. This, he felt, made checking this type of information very time-consuming for both librarians and faculty members.

3. Two Duke professors were unhappy with the way book order requests were handled within the department. One was unclear about the form to use in requesting book orders because he had been given a detailed card relevant for the librarians' own process of searching. More communication is needed here.

4. One anthropologist despised filling out individual McBee cards for each book checked out and felt this was a terrible waste of faculty time. He much preferred the old book pocket card circulation system in use at the library where he did his graduate work.

5. One Duke professor felt the library was doing a superb job overall and that what it needed most was much more money and a more centralized organization. He was extremely unhappy with the growth of departmental libraries at Duke University.

6. Two Duke professors complained about ineffective interlibrary loan service, while another said, "The interlibrary loan is absolutely first-rate here." The latter professor was also very happy with services provided by U. N. C.'s library; he telephones librarians at U. N. C., who either provide reference information or send books over to Duke for him.

7. One Duke professor suggested that undergraduates be given a course in library usage because he was convinced that students do not know how to make the best use of the library.

8. Another Duke professor wanted to turn Duke's open

stacks system into a completely closed stacks system and employ students to retrieve books on request. In most cases he felt he knew what book he needed, and that browsing was not necessary.

9. One felt that Duke ought to organize a central film bureau, such as U. N. C.'s, in order to facilitate the loan, purchase, and rental of films.

10. One greatly resented Duke's circulation policy for books in storage. For a historical source that he needs he has to wait three days for the book to be retrieved from storage, and then he is only allowed to keep the book for one day before returning it.

11. One greatly disliked Duke's policy of letting faculty members check out books for a year because other faculty members apparently ignore notices when he attempts to call them in for his own use.

U. N. C. interviewees:

1. One U. N. C. professor wanted a revolution in libraries: a push button, computerized system to either bring the exact book or page to the patron or else to print out the exact information needed.

2. Two anthropologists argued for more modest changes, such as more flexible check-out periods for reserve books and at least a partially open reserve system.[9] Another felt that there were not enough duplicate copies available for the reserve system. Because of this, he made little use of the reserve system and assigned mainly inexpensive paperback books for his undergraduate courses.

3. One U. N. C. anthropologist was unhappy about the waste involved in placing book order requests through the library. No one had explained to him the amount of searching that must take place before an order is sent, and no one had explained to him that U. N. C. had stopped its practice of using blanket orders for many publishers. He was unhappy that he was never notified when his book order requests were processed and books were received; he was only notified when the book had previously

---

[9]The U. N. C. reserve system already has two-hour, twenty-four hour, and seven-day optional check out periods to be selected by the faculty member. The seven-day option is an open reserve option.

been ordered or when it had been in the library before he requested it. He thought that this was wasteful, but he felt it was too time-consuming for him to check the catalog himself before making book order requests.

4. Two mentioned the problem of missing books as being severe at U. N. C. Not only were books often hard to locate; determining the status of books within the graduate library was a problem because books were often not traceable. One felt that an important improvement would be to make certain that guards at the door searched people thoroughly. This anthropologist felt that some guards were not doing their duty, and books were easily being taken without being checked out.

5. One was unhappy with U. N. C.'s policy of allocating the lion's share of book funds to individual departments. He felt that acquisitions should be "done centrally with some sort of well staffed bibliographic service in the library." This service would be staffed by bibliographers who know the field and who would acquire the major publications. The departments would be able to request other things to fill in gaps the bibliographers would miss. He believes this system would be less haphazard than passing around Library of Congress proofslips and publishers' catalogs, which sometimes are not seen by all faculty members before departmental money is all encumbered. He felt that many important items would not necessarily be in the Library of Congress proofslips or the publishers' catalogs which are circulated.

6. One felt that U. N. C. does not adequately subscribe to the little known foreign language journals and newspapers.

7. One said that the U. N. C. graduate library was poor in terms of ease and comfort of use.

8. One anthropologist believed that many undergraduates probably do not know how to use the U. N. C. graduate library and that more research is needed on this question.

Comments shared in common:

1. Many anthropologists do not use the library frequently. Four of the Duke faculty members and four of the U. N. C. faculty members (40 per cent of the sample) voluntarily admitted that they did not often

use the library. Another U. N. C. professor said that he viewed the library as "just an extension of his own personal library."

2. Use of the Human Relations Area Files has been very limited. Only one Duke professor mentioned having used them, while four volunteered that they had never used them, two others said they were irrelevant or worse from the point of view of physical anthropology. Of the U. N. C. professors at least four have used the HRAF successfully, while two others have tried unsuccessfully, and one said that they were of no use to him.

3. Six anthropologists (30 per cent) offered complaints about cataloging or classification problems. Two Duke professors complained about how Dewey Decimal Classification splits the materials they need. One Duke linguistics specialist had grave doubts about the inadequate and irrelevant Library of Congress subject headings used at Duke. Two U. N C. linguistics specialists were critical of their library's cataloging, and one of them specified insufficient subject headings and split series as major problems. Two other U. N. C. anthropologists criticized the inadequacy of Library of Congress subject headings, and one of these also criticized the library for inconsistent treatment of Spanish last names; sometimes authors are entered under their mothers' names and sometimes under their fathers' names.

Summary of Conclusions

1. These anthropologists rely heavily upon journals and books and seldom use monographic bibliographies, indexes, and abstracting services. The only newsletters they read are their personal copies.

2. They are aware of the fact that they are not making the best use of library resources in the Triangle Region. Out of twenty only one had been to North Carolina State University's library. Eleven (55 per cent) had never been to the neighboring university's library only ten miles away. Almost all had, however, made use of interlibrary loan at their home university.

3. Nearly half of these anthropologists see themselves as theoretically oriented, while one half see themselves as equally interested in theoretical and geographical orientations. Only one anthropologist said he was mainly geographically oriented. This high emphasis on theoretical orientations may be

partially responsible for the low rate of HRAF usage.

4. Information needs change at far different rates for different professors. As one might expect, the information needs of young faculty members seemed to change more rapidly than those of older, longer established faculty members. Anthropologists felt that changes in their needs would be reflected in their book orders, and they showed virtually no knowledge that librarians might be interested in hearing about their changes in interest. Only a small proportion of interviewees apparently realized that librarians select books too.

5. The majority of anthropologists did not see their department as having a specific orientation. They view their departments as groups of eclectic specialists "doing their own thing." For this reason very few foresaw a change in their department's own orientation; more U. N. C. than Duke faculty members saw a shift towards applied or practical anthropology.

6. Although fieldwork is still seen as crucial to anthropology, acculturation, political problems, and financial problems are making fieldwork in exotic cultures more and more difficult. Consequently, anthropologists will be turning more towards fieldwork in America, action anthropology, and more library research. Eighty per cent of the interviewees felt that library research would become more important for the discipline.

7. The importance of prepublication information (in the form of papers) was extremely high for linguists, low for physical anthropologists, fairly high for archeologists, and of variable importance for sociocultural anthropologists. Sixty per cent of the sample found prepublication communication to be very important, and all felt that informal means of communication were important.

8. Anthropological field notes are very seldom used by other anthropologists, and few of the interviewees expressed the desire to make use of archival collections.

9. Although half of the interviewees appreciated particular newsletters, many were unenthusiastic about a hypothesized current awareness service in newsletter form. Newsletters read by anthropologists are personal subscriptions, not library subscriptions.

10. Few of these professors had had first-hand experience with computers, but most saw the usefulness of a computerized comprehensive bibliography. Some suggested that a historical bibliography would be more useful than a current one. Most of these anthropologists did not need data banks of statistical information.

11. Anthropologists find problems with the cataloging at both universities, and Library of Congress subject headings seemed to be inadequate or irrelevant for several of the interviewees' needs.

12. Few faculty members of either department used the HRAF. Some expressed great distrust for its sampling and distrusted the cross-cultural generalizations it has generated.

13. Forty per cent of the sample do not use the library frequently. Most rely on their personal collections and information from colleagues in keeping up-to-date. Libraries are generally used for background reading for research projects or for checking information for lectures, but libraries are not normally used on a day-to-day basis. Professors sometimes have little more contact with the library than sending their lists of books for reserve to the library reserve room.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

Since this research was conceived as exploratory research, it was not intended to solve all possible questions in the realm of anthropological information problems. Many more areas need to be explored, namely the importance of browsing, information problems of undergraduates, differences between beginning graduate students and those who have completed their fieldwork, differences between faculty information needs for teaching and for research, and different pathways for research strategies. This study has emphasized the use and value of sources of information more than it has the paths students and faculty take in research activity. Nevertheless, the two most important findings of this study are the high importance of footnotes and informal communication and the low importance of card catalogs and bibliographic aids for anthropologists. Both of these findings imply clear patterns in the way anthropologists make use of their literature and libraries, and ramifications of these patterns will be discussed shortly.

Prime objectives of this research were to discover differences between U. N. C. and Duke respondents, between faculty members and students, and between the Duke-U. N. C. sample; the surprising finding is that there were so few

differences between these pairs.

U. N. C.'s department is more oriented towards applied anthropology and sociology than is Duke's department, but neither department has a clearcut orientation. Students spend more time per week than faculty members do gathering information related to anthropology, students make more use of bibliographic aids than do faculty members, and students have more difficulty using certain forms of the literature. Faculty members are able to subscribe to the most important journals themselves, while students must either borrow them or use them in the library. The Duke-U. N. C. faculty sample was less experienced and less prolific than the Amsden sample. Duke and U. N. C. faculty members were considerably more satisfied with their libraries' collections than were Amsden's professionals; yet, on the whole similarities between these pairs outweighed the differences.

Both students and faculty members proved to be extremely specialized in their interest areas. All of these groups relied heavily on a small number of major American journals and found certain forms of literature, such as foreign monographs, government publications, handbooks, technical reports, and encyclopedias, to be of far less importance. All felt that loans and photocopies supplied were by far the most important library services. All agreed that scattering of library materials was a major problem. Both Duke and U. N. C. faculty members and Amsden's sample agreed that teaching was their most time-consuming activity. Most important of all,

all groups agreed that conversation with other anthropologists and footnotes or bibliographies in books were the most important ways they use to obtain information.[1]

This study found that professional anthropologists do make considerable use of the vast literature available, but the library is often not central to their work. Survey results demonstrated the low value faculty members and--to a far lesser extent--students place on the library card catalog. Interviews showed that faculty members generally buy the books and journals most often used in their work, and they use the library for the more esoteric, out-of-print, and expensive publications. They receive many recent books as gifts from publishers, and part of their information comes from sources they have collected themselves. As one faculty member said:

> My use of the library is pretty narrow at this point. If I could afford to buy the books, I probably wouldn't go over there at all. . . I'm mostly concerned with analyzing field data, so the library is not that crucial to me, although it can become crucial when you need a book that you have to have in order to make your [paper] complete.

No students were interviewed, although from many lengthy, informal convervations with beginning Duke graduate students, it appears that students are generally more reliant upon library resources than faculty members are. Students

---

[1]Comments made in the Duke and U. N. C. interviews made it clear that footnotes in journals were equally important as those in books. Again, Amsden's survey had the category of "Anthropological literature," which for her sample was considerably more important than even conversation or footnotes.

normally have much less developed networks of informal contacts to rely on for current information, and they can not usually afford to go to conferences. They can afford fewer information resources of their own and, thus, are forced to use library periodicals or those that they can borrow from other students and faculty members. This is not to say that all students use the library more than all faculty members. Some faculty members do extensive historical research, and do make considerable use of library resources.

Informal conversation is extraordinarily important for students, just as it is for faculty members, but students have less mobility than most faculty members. From the author's personal experience it seems fair to say that student sources for informal communication center on fellow students and faculty members within their department. The faculty members' informal communication is also strong with students and colleagues in the department, but it also includes many other contacts with professionals around the country or around the world.[2] These provide a crucial source of current information from which graduate students--at least beginning graduate students--generally do not benefit.

Forty per cent of the faculty members interviewed made

---

[2]One of Meredith Altshuler's findings in her research on medical anthropologists was that they wanted improved communication between colleagues. They wanted "increased circulation of working papers, meetings of small groups for discussion rather than reading papers, and a letter journal of field work reports" (Medical Anthropology: a Case Study of Inter-disciplinary Information Needs. Unpublished research paper, School of Library Science. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, p.32)

little use of the library, and it is important to ask ourselves why this is the case. It is true that some anthropologists are involved in working over their own field data, but there are other reasons. Keeping up with teaching, administrative duties, and writing takes a considerable amount of time, and there is an avalanche of journal articles and book reviews to read. Even those who often use the library feel that it is hard to find time to use it enough.

These anthropologists feel that conversation with other anthropologists and footnotes enable them to select what is most important for their information needs. As J. M. Brittain has written, "The increasing reliance placed upon informal communication is the scientist's way of adjusting to the information explosion and satisfying those information needs which formal channels do not or cannot fulfil."[3] The relatively sparse research in behavioral science information retrieval has demonstrated the importance of informal communication or what has been called the "invisible college."[4] These informal channels provide current relevant information

---

[3]J. M. Brittain, Information and its Users: a Review with Special Reference to the Social Sciences (New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1970), p. 78.

[4]National Research Council. Committee on Information in the Behavioral Sciences, Communication Systems and Resources in the Behavioral Sciences (Washington: National Academy of Sciences, 1967), p. 13. See also Amsden, "Information Problems of Anthropologists," p. 125. John S. Appel and Ted Gurr's study of behavioral scientists, which included one-third anthropologists, ("Bibliographic Needs of Social and Behavioral Scientists: Report of a Pilot Survey," American Behavioral Scientist, VII (June, 1964), p. 52) found "personal communication" to be somewhat useful, but far less important than "conversation with anthropologists" was for the Amsden and Duke-U. N. C. samples.

unavailable in published sources, but do so in an inefficient and temporary fashion. Not everyone is kept up-to-date on a wide variety of subfields within anthropology. The strength of informal channels for communication seems to be both a product and a reinforcer of extreme specialization within the field.

Duke and U. N. C. respondents also considered footnotes to be extremely important, and this might well support L. Uytterschaut's findings on the research patterns of social scientists. His interviewees' main concern was "to locate as quickly as possible the leading authors and standard works in the field" with the hope that these leaders would provide selected bibliographies of the most important literature.[5] In order to update these bibliographies, Uytterschaut found that social scientists turn to secondary sources and major periodicals. Duke and U. N. C. anthropologists also make considerable use of book reviews and publishers' announcements.

Duke and U. N. C. professional anthropologists evaluate the library card catalog as relatively unimportant. This fact, coupled with the importance of footnotes and the relative unimportance of bibliographic aids, leads to several interesting questions about library usage.

For journal articles this research did not show whether anthropologists more often browse or more often seek specific articles; each university has a serials catalog with which

---

[5]L. Uytterschaut, "Literature Searching Methods in Social Science Research: a Pilot Inquiry," American Behavioral Scientist, IX (May, 1966), p. 24.

one can locate serials without going to the card catalog. For books, however, the unimportance of the card catalog either implies that library books are not often used or that browsing is a more common practice than seeking specific titles. Since, according to survey data, these anthropologists rate books almost as important as American journals, it would be logical to expect browsing to be the more common pathway to information in library books. Future research on library usage should test this hypothesis.

From a librarian's point of view, the unimportance of bibliographic aids was one of the most interesting findings of this research. Anthropologists were often unfamiliar with Abstracts in Anthropology, and when asked to list the indexes and abstracts they used, twenty of the sixty-four survey respondents skipped the question, while eleven of the remaining forty-four answered that they used none. Only thirty-three of the sixty-four used and listed indexes or abstracts, and on the average they only cited between one and two titles each. In this area librarians can provide an important service by teaching both students and faculty members how to use the available bibliographic aids.

Amsden's research also showed that anthropologists make relatively little use of indexes and abstracting services, and that there are sometimes problems of incomplete coverage and unsatisfactory indexing by these services.[6] Likewise,

---

[6] Amsden, "Information Problems of Anthropologists," p. 125, p. 129.

Appel and Gurr found that only 15 per cent of the anthropologists in their study made use of abstracts.[7] Also, 89 per cent of the social scientists they surveyed did not know of the Unesco international bibliographies or else felt they were "irrelevant or seldom useful for their work."

Opinions of Duke and U. N. C. interviewees on the value of abstracts were mixed--some liked them and some highly distrusted their accuracy. Clearly, abstracting services need improvement, and perhaps indexing services do too, but Duke and U. N. C. anthropologists are almost certainly not using these services to their full potential.

In addition, the Human Relations Area Files, located at U. N. C. are not often being used by members of either department. One reason is that the files are of limited value to archeologists, linguists, and physical anthropologists.[8] There are considerable methodological problems in doing cross-cultural statistical research.[9] Some professors interviewed had qualms about the sampling used in creating the files, others did not find the kinds of information they needed in the files, and others simply did not find time or reason to use them. This problem requires a full scale study

---

[7]Appel and Gurr, "Bibliographic Needs of Social and Behavioral Scientists: Report of a Pilot Survey," p. 52.

[8]These fields account for six of the eleven Duke professors and six of the twenty-two U. N. C. professors surveyed.

[9]Marvin Harris, The Rise of Anthropological Theory; a History of Theories of Culture (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1968), pp. 614-15, p. 632.

itself, but the files can still be profitably used, especially for rapid fact finding. It is possible that anthropologists need further education in using the HRAF; it is also likely that the HRAF may need to be improved to make different types of theoretical research more convenient. The computerized index to the contents of the HRAF is certainly a step in the right direction;[10] the HRAF bibliographies should be useful for all sociocultural anthropologists, but at present U. N. C. and Duke sociocultural anthropologists are not very interested in the files.

In general, the two departments are relatively satisfied with available collections at both libraries; however, many faculty members make heavier use of their personal resources than library resources. This is probably the major reason why anthropologists make little use of bibliographic aids. Many rely heavily on conversation and footnotes for information leading to prime sources. If they can not buy or borrow crucial publications, then they make use of the library.[11]

Faculty reactions seem to correspond to what Fremont

---

[10] Donald Morrison, "Indexing the Human Relations Area Files," American Behavioral Scientist, VII (June, 1964), pp. 49-50.

[11] The importance of browsing was not determined in this research, although from other data collected it also appears to be a significant pathway to library usage. From personal experience students doing term papers often use footnotes and conversation to learn the most important sources and then go to the library to browse the shelves surrounding the crucial sources. Browsing may, thus, be more useful for finding secondary material.

Rider called "the demand for book immediateness," the desire "to have their research materials available. . . under their own finger tips wherever they may happen to be working."[12] In this case convenience of access makes personal possession or borrowing from colleagues preferable to searching through libraries. What any anthropologist has to do is select the important literature and gain access to it. Faculty members generally build relatively large personal collections of the most useful works, and they go to the library for the less often used material. Students want to build their own personal libraries too, but can not afford much of what they need. Beginning graduate students make heavy use of the library's multiple copies of crucial works, while advanced graduate students make use of more specialized material as well. Convenience of access is important to all, and personal possession is the most convenient means of access.

Description of anthropological information retrieval is further complicated by the fact that faculty members desire some sort of comprehensive computerized bibliography. The idea behind indexes, abstracts, the Peabody Museum Catalog, and the HRAF is to make literature searching easier and more systematic; yet, these aids play a minor role at Duke and U. N. C. This might imply that these anthropologists have a limited amount of time available for comprehensive literature

---

[12]This phrase was actually used in the context of library cooperation, but its truth applies here as well. See Fremont Rider, The Scholar and the Future of the Research Library (New York: Hacham Press, 1944), p. 82, 83.

searching. Part of the problem may be that there are still too many sources to consult in making a comprehensive literature search. The main benefits of a computerized bibliographic system, as the faculty see it, would be in speed and comprehensiveness.

The faculty members of the two departments have not yet given enough time to consideration of what a computerized bibliography could do for them. They have not yet discussed or agreed upon factors which would benefit their own departments, much less the entire field of anthropology. Judging from faculty opinions, it seems that no one system will satisfy all of their needs. Many see a computerized bibliography as useful within their specific subarea but view a computerized bibliography for the entire field as a dream too expensive to realize.

Familiarity with the computerized systems discussed in Amsden's article would help anthropologists to decide on what they need. Also, the Human Relations Area Files Automated Bibliographic System (HABS) is making significant strides in developing computerized bibliographies useful to anthropologists.

Advantages of this system include the following possibilities: 1) multidimensional analysis--the ability to specify subject, time and area; 2) multilevel analysis--the ability to classify each major variable (i.e., subject, time, area) in both broad and specific terms; 3) integrated approach to analysis--the ability to index both generic and specific

concepts; 4) data quality control and annotations--information regarding the author and the nature, language, and source of the data; and 5) the ability to produce varied types of output and the capability to produce "tailor-made" bibliographies.[13] All of these features would likely be useful in a computerized bibliographic system for all anthropological information.[14]

In any case anthropologists realize that in the future they will have to make more extensive use of libraries than they do now. As the number of anthropologists continues to rise, so will the quantities of publications they will need to read in order to keep current. The longer anthropologists wait, the harder it will be for them to establish any kind of comprehensive bibliographic control. In the future anthropology will probably remain an extremely heterogeneous field which borrows from many other fields of behavioral and natural science.

At present these anthropologists are reasonably content with available library collections, although they find them to be too scattered and not well enough organized. Many of these problems seem to derive from classification systems which separate anthropological materials, and for now these schemes are too well entrenched to be done away with.

---

[13] See Hesung C. Koh, "An Automated Bibliographic System: HABS," Behavior Science Notes, IV (1969), 70-79.

[14] For more information on anthropology and computers, see publications by Hymes and Pelto on the bibliography. For more on automated bibliographies, see publications by Davis, Garfield, Koh, Pearson and Jones, and Behavior Science Notes, IV, no. 1, 1969.

Both Dewey and the Library of Congress classification systems cause dissatisfaction; yet, replacing them is a tremendous expense, and alternative classification systems are of questionable value.[15] Perhaps, librarians can help out here by pressuring Library of Congress and Dewey editors to make these systems more responsive to the needs of anthropology.

Lastly, few of the faculty members interviewed revealed an understanding of how fast library expenses are rising. Many seemed to take the library for granted as a nice asset to the university, but nothing to worry about. As the cost of information rises, as publishing increases, and as the ground conditions of anthropology change, they will have to rely more and more on library resources. Academic libraries rely heavily on faculty support for gaining more money from the university administration and the state legislature. Professional anthropologists have a role to play in preserving the quality of these libraries, and they should realize that their support is necessary for the libraries of the future. In supporting libraries, they will preserve an important link in the information transfer chain, and thus, ensure the future of superior anthropological research.

---

[15] Mr. Kotei in a report presented at the international conference of the International African Institute, Nairobi, 1967, found that "the much used library classification schemes" are generally inadequate for African studies. He felt that Bliss would probably be more satisfactory than U. D. C., Dewey, or L. C. for use in Africana libraries interested solely in the social sciences and humanities. See J. D. Pearson and Ruth Jones, "African Bibliography," Africa, XXXVIII (July, 1968), p. 313.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Please place check marks by the appropriate answers. There is space allotted for comments on page four. Please feel free to use it.

I. Which are you? faculty member _____
graduate student, non-teaching _____
graduate student, teaching _____

II. How many years have you been a graduate student or a faculty member?
_____

III. What is the highest degree that you hold?
B.A. or B.S. _____
M.A. or M.S. _____
Ph.D. or equivalent advanced degree (please specify) _____

IV. When was this degree earned? _____

V. What are your most important areas of specialization within the broad spectrum of anthropology?
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

VI. If you teach, do you have assistants who help you in doing library research?
yes _____
no _____

If yes, then what kinds of library research do they do for you?
_____
_____
_____

VII. What are your most time-consuming activities? Please rank them in order, with 1 being the most time-consuming activity.
administration _____
consultation _____
fieldwork _____
other research _____
editing _____
teaching _____
writing _____
other (please specify) _____

VIII. How many publications have you produced in the last five years?
books _____
articles _____
conference papers (only those published) _____
book reviews _____
other published items (please specify) _____

IX. What foreign languages do you read adequately for your anthropological research interests? Please list.
_____
_____

X. What ways do you use to get information about anthropology? Please check the appropriate frequency.

	FREQUENTLY	SOMETIMES	NEVER
Conversation with other anthropologists	____	____	____
Conversation with non-anthropologists	____	____	____
Social gatherings with colleagues	____	____	____
Conferences and other formal meetings	____	____	____
Visiting speakers	____	____	____
Correspondence	____	____	____
Prepublication information	____	____	____
Non-anthropological literature	____	____	____
Library card catalog	____	____	____
Indexes and abstracts	____	____	____
Footnotes or bibliographies in books	____	____	____
Separate or monographic bibliographies	____	____	____
Book reviews or publishers' announcements	____	____	____
Seminar presentations	____	____	____
Other _____	____	____	____

XI. Please list the subject areas outside of anthropology whose literature you search, and please check the frequency.

	FREQUENTLY	SOMETIMES
_____	____	____
_____	____	____
_____	____	____
_____	____	____
_____	____	____

XII. How many hours per week do you spend getting information related to your interests as an anthropologist? (This includes time spent gathering information in subject areas outside of anthropology *per se*)

0-9 _____
10-19 _____
20-29 _____
30-39 _____
40-49 _____
50-59 _____
60 or over _____

XIII. Please list the five periodicals you use most frequently.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

How many of these five do you subscribe to personally? _____

XIV. Please list the abstracting and indexing services you use and check the frequency of use.

	FREQUENTLY	SOMETIMES
_____	____	____
_____	____	____
_____	____	____
_____	____	____
_____	____	____

XV. What forms of literature do you use, how important are they to you, and how easy are they to use successfully?

	IMPORTANCE			EASE OF SUCCESS IN USE		
	Great	Moderate	Little	Easy	Moderate	Difficult
Elementary (under-grad) texts						
Advanced (grad) texts						
All monographs						
Foreign monographs						
American journals						
Foreign journals						
Review publications						
Government publications						
International organization publications						
Technical reports						
Encyclopedias						
Dictionaries and glossaries						
Handbooks						
Masters' theses, manuscripts, and other unpublished material						
Doctoral dissertations						
Newspapers						
Maps						
Human Relations Area Files						

XVI. What is the importance of library services for your information needs? (Please assume that these services are available)

	NOW		IN THE FUTURE
	Sometimes Important	Very Important	We Need More of This
Loans and photocopies supplied			
Quick reference service, e.g., telephone			
Brief literature search			
Comprehensive literature search, e.g., bibliography			
Critical survey of literature			
Translations			
Abstracts of specified articles			
Editorial assistance, e.g., proofreading			
Help in location of audio-visual materials			
Guidance by library staff			
Library accession lists			

XVII. How often do you experience the following problems in gathering information?

	FREQUENTLY	SOMETIMES	NEVER
Not knowing where to go for information	____	____	____
Incomplete coverage by index and abstracting services	____	____	____
Unsatisfactory indexing by index and abstracting services	____	____	____
Inadequate or insufficient help from library staff	____	____	____
Inadequate cataloging of library materials	____	____	____
Difficulty in obtaining foreign publications	____	____	____
Difficulty in obtaining unpublished material	____	____	____
Difficulty in obtaining technical reports	____	____	____
Not enough copies of some material	____	____	____
Published information in your area of specialization is inadequate	____	____	____
Library collections in your area of specialization are inadequately organized	____	____	____
Information published is not up-to-date	____	____	____
Information available is not up-to-date	____	____	____
Difficulty in locating material listed in card catalog	____	____	____
Library collections in your home university are too scattered	____	____	____
Library collections in your home university are inadequate	____	____	____
Library collections in the Triangle Region are inadequate	____	____	____

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

I.A. First of all, do you have any comments to make regarding the survey?

B. Did it cover the ares you expected?

C. Did it accomplish what you expected it to?

D. Are there other related areas that you would like to see investigated more thoroughly?

II.A. How long have you been using the library here?

B. How well does the library here fulfill your special information needs, and along with this, what are your special needs?

C. Next, I would like to ask about the different forms of library materials and how well the available resources at this library satisfy your library needs.

To what extent do the available books satisfy your needs?
The available periodicals?
The available monographic bibliographies?
The available indexes?
The available abstracting services?
The available newsletters?

E. Are the overall anthropology collections here adequate? If not, do you have any ideas on how they could be improved?

F. Do you feel you are making the best use of resources available in the Triangle Region?

G. Do you often use U. N. C.'s or N. C. State's libraries?

H. Do you often use interlibrary loan?

I. Is your use of the literature more theoretically oriented, or is it more geographically oriented?

J. A major function of the library is to support the needs of the faculty. If the information needs of the faculty change, then the library should react to these changes in terms of its collection building. Have your own information needs changed over the last few years?

K. Have the information needs of the department changed recently? Is this due to the changing composition of the faculty, or do you see a changing orientation in the anthropology department here?

L. Do you think that library research will become more important in relation to field work as time goes on?

M. How important would you rate prepublication communication in anthropology?

N. What about field notes of other scholars who have worked in your area of specialization? Do you use them, and can you get to see them when you need to?

O. If a special information service were available covering your main fields of interest through frequent newsletters, and assuming it wasn't overpriced, would that be useful to you in keeping up-to-date?

III.A. If some computerized system could be designed to retrieve anthropological information, do you have any ideas as to how you would like to see it organized?

B. What forms of information would you request be included in this system?

Citations?
Abstracts?
Other information?

C. What about statistical information such as Harris poll data, which is commonly presented in tabular form? Would you want this information, e.g., voting analysis by ethnic group, included in this system?

IV.A. Are there any areas of information needs or library problems which interest you and which we have not yet covered?

APPENDIX C

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES

TABLE 20

SUBJECT AREAS WITHIN ANTHROPOLOGY

	Duke	U. N. C.	Total
Life Sciences			
Ecology		4	4
Cultural Ecology		1	1
Human Ecology		1	1
Paleoecology		1	1
Ethnobotany		2	2
Evolution		2	2
Human and Primate Evolution	1		1
Human Evolution	1		1
Molecular Evolution	1		1
Primate Evolution	1		1
Fossil Man	1		1
Functional Morphology	1		1
Genetics		1	1
Medical Anthropology	1	6	7
Medecine and Anthropology		1	1
Osteology	1		1
Physical Anthropology	5	4	9
Primates, Primatology	1	1	2
Primate Adaptations	1		1
Primate Anatomy	1		1
Primate Behavior	2		2
Primate Paleontology	1		1
Totals	19	24	43
Physical Sciences and Archeology			
Archeology	1	3	4
Archeology (Eastern U.S.)		1	1
Archeology (Mesoamerica)		1	1
Archeology (Old World)		1	1
Archeology (Paleolithic)	1		1
Pleistocene Geochronology	1		1
Totals	3	6	9
Applied Fields			
Applied Anthropology		4	4
Photography	1		1
Population		2	2
Population Anthropology		2	2
Population Ecology		1	1
Totals	1	9	10

TABLE 20--Continued

Sociocultural Anthropology and Other Related Fields	Duke	U. N. C.	Total
Aging	1		1
Anti-imperialist Anthropology	1		1
Black Studies		1	1
New World Negro		1	1
Comparative Family		1	1
Cognition		1	1
Complex Societies	1		1
Cross-Cultural Studies		2	2
Cultural Anthropology	3	2	5
Culture and Personality		3	3
Culture Change	1		1
Intentional Culture Change		1	1
Distribution Systems	1		1
Economic Anthropology	2	1	3
Education		1	1
Educational Anthropology	1		1
Ethnography		1	1
Ethnography (Southeast U.S.)	1		1
Ethnography of Humour	1		1
Ethnohistory		1	1
Ethnology		2	2
Ethno-Psycho Pharmacology	1		1
Exchange Networks	1		1
Field Methods		2	2
Folk Culture (Europe)		1	1
Folklore		1	1
General Systems Theory in Anthropology		1	1
History (Southeast U.S.)	1		1
Kinship	3		3
West African Kinship	1		1
Minorities		1	1
Modernization	3	1	4
Peasants	1	1	2
Political Anthropology	1		1
Socio-Political Organization		1	1
Proxemics		1	1
Psychological Anthropology	3	5	8
Religion	2		2
Primitive Religion	1		1
Sociology of Religion	1		1
Social Anthropology	4	5	9
Social Organization	1	1	2
Social Structure		1	1
Social Control and Social Change	1		1
Social Psychiatry		1	1
Social Science Methods		1	1
Socio-Cultural Anthropology		3	3
Techno-Environmental Determinism		1	1

TABLE 20--Continued

	Duke	U. N. C.	Total
Sociocultural Anthropology and Other Related Fields--Continued			
Theory	1	1	2
Anthropological History and Theory	1		1
Anthropological Theory	1		1
Urban Anthropology	1	4	5
Urbanization	1		1
Women's Roles and Fertility		1	1
Totals	43	52	95
Linguistics			
Cognitive Anthropology	4		4
Language Acquisition	1		1
Language of Culture		1	1
Languages (American Indian)		1	1
Linguistic Anthropology	2		2
Linguistic Theory		1	1
Linguistics	3	2	5
Phonetics		1	1
Phonology		1	1
Semantics		1	1
Sociolinguistics	1		1
Syntax		1	1
Totals	11	9	20
Area Studies			
Africa	1	3	4
East Africa	1		1
Amerindians		1	1
North America		1	1
North American Indians		1	1
Caribbean		2	2
Corsica	1		1
Europe	1		1
Latin America		1	1
Mediterranean	1		1
Mesoamerica		1	1
Middle East	1	2	3
New World	1		1
North Carolina (Rural)		1	1
South Asia	1		1
Southern Appalachians	1		1
	9	13	22

(n=64)

TABLE 21

WAYS USED TO GAIN INFORMATION ABOUT ANTHROPOLOGY

ANALYZED BY ACADEMIC STATUS

	Frequently		Sometimes		Never		Total		
	F[a]	G	F	G	F	G	F	G	T
Conversation with other anthropologists	16	31	6	9	1	0	23	40	63
Conversation with non-anthropologists	2	7	19	26	2	6	23	39	62
Social gatherings with colleagues	5	10	15	23	3	7	23	40	63
Conferences and other formal meetings	6	3	17	27	0	9	23	39	62
Visiting speakers	0	4	23	33	0	3	23	40	63
Correspondence	7	1	14	20	2	18	23	39	62
Prepublication information	4	2	14	18	5	19	23	39	62
Non-anthropological information	10	8	13	28	0	4	23	40	63
Library card catalog	1	13	13	21	9	7	23	41	64
Indexes and abstracts	2	10	16	25	5	5	23	40	63
Footnotes or bibliographies in books	15	32	8	8	0	0	23	40	63
Separate or monographic bibliographies	4	19	15	18	1	2	20	39	59
Book reviews or publishers' announcements	11	15	12	20	0	4	23	39	62
Seminar presentations	0	9	21	[illegible]	2	2	23	39	62
Other	3	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	10

(n=64)

[a]F=faculty members, G=graduate students, T=total.

TABLE 22

WAYS USED TO GAIN INFORMATION ABOUT ANTHROPOLOGY

ANALYZED BY UNIVERSITY

	Frequently		Sometimes		Never		Total		
	D[a]	U	D	U	D	U	D	U	T
Conversation with other anthropologists	21	26	5	10	1	0	27	36	63
Conversation with non-anthropologists	6	3	19	26	2	6	27	35	62
Social gatherings with colleagues	9	6	15	23	3	7	27	36	63
Conferences and other formal meetings	5	4	18	26	3	6	26	36	62
Visiting speakers	2	2	23	33	2	1	27	36	63
Correspondence	5	3	11	23	11	9	27	35	62
Prepublication information	4	2	13	19	10	14	27	35	62
Non-anthropological information	8	10	18	23	1	3	27	36	63
Library card catalog	5	9	12	22	10	6	27	37	64
Indexes and abstracts	5	7	13	28	9	1	27	36	63
Footnotes or bibliographies in books	25	22	2	14	0	0	27	36	63
Separate or monographic bibliographies	10	13	13	20	2	1	25	34	59
Book reviews or publishers' announcements	11	15	12	20	4	0	27	35	62
Seminar presentations	4	5	21	28	2	2	27	35	62
Other	3	7	0	0	0	0	10	0	10

(n=64)

[a] D=Duke, U= U. N. C., T=total.

TABLE 23

SUBJECT AREAS OUTSIDE OF ANTHROPOLOGY

	Duke	U. N. C.	Total
Life Sciences			
Anatomy	2	1	3
Human Anatomy	1		1
Non-Primate Anatomy	1		1
Animal Behavior		1	1
Animal Ethology		1	1
Biology	3	2	5
Evolutionary Biology	1		1
Botany	1	2	3
Economic Botany		1	1
Dentistry	1		1
Drug Literature	1		1
Ecology		1	1
Genetics		1	1
Medical Literature (Including surgery, etc.)	1	6	7
Mycology		1	1
Ornithology	1		1
Paleontology	2		2
Primatology	1	1	2
Psychiatry	1	1	2
Zoology	4	4	8
Totals	21	23	44
Physical Sciences			
Acoustical Literature		1	1
Geology	4	1	5
Physical Sciences		1	1
Physics	1		1
Soil Science		1	1
Totals	5	4	9
Applied Fields			
City Planning		1	1
Communication		1	1
Community Development	1		1
Film Making	1		1
Radio-TV-Motion Pictures		1	1
Photography	1		1
Physical Therapy		1	1
Population		1	1
Public Health	1	3	4
Social Work		1	1
Statistics	1		1
Totals	5	9	14

TABLE 23--Continued

	Duke	U. N. C.	Total
Social Sciences, Humanities, Etc.			
Art History		1	1
Classics	1		1
Decision Theory	1		1
Economics	1	3	4
Neo-Marxist Economics	1		1
English		1	1
Ethnohistory		1	1
Folklore	1	2	3
General Systems Theory		1	1
Geography	1	5	6
Gerontology	1		1
History	4	8	12
American Colonial		1	1
Spanish Colonial		1	1
Economic History		1	1
Linguistics	6		6
Literature	1		1
Modern and Contemporary Literature	1		1
Mathematics	1		1
Peasants, Rural European		1	1
Philosophy	3		3
Political Science	3	4	7
Psychology	7	10	17
Cognitive Psychology	1		1
Mathematical Psychology	1		1
Religious Writings	1		1
Social Psychiatry		1	1
Sociology	4	14	18
Historical Sociology		1	1
Urban Studies		2	2
Totals	40	58	98
Cultural Area Studies			
African Journals		1	1
Arctic		1	1
Caribbean Studies		1	1
Middle East Studies and Journals	1	1	2
Totals	1	4	5

(n=59)

TABLE 24

SERIALS[a]

	Duke	U. N. C.	Total
Academy of Political Science Proceedings		1	1
Africa	1	1	2
Akwesasne Notes		1	1
American Anthropologist	22	32	54
American Antiquity	2	7	9
American Association of Geographers Annals		1	1
American Journal of Human Genetics	1	1	2
American Journal of Physical Anthropology	8	5	13
American Journal of Psychiatry		1	1
American Journal of Public Health		2	2
American Journal of Sociology	2	2	4
American Sociological Review	1	4	5
Anatomical Record		1	1
Anthropologica	1		1
Anthropological Linguistics	2		2
Anthropological Quarterly		1	1
Appalachian Review	1		1
Asian Perspectives	1		1
Behavior Science Notes		1	1
Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indie		1	1
Biochemical Genetics	1		1
Black Scholar		1	1
Bulletin of the History of Medecine	1		1
Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin		1	1
Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology		1	1
Caribbean Monograph Series	1		1
Caribbean Studies		1	1
Champlain Society publications	1		1
Comparative Studies in Society and History	1		1
Current Anthropology	12	26	38
Daedalus	1		1
Demography		2	2
Economic Botany		1	1
Economic Development and Cultural Change	1		1
Ethnohistory		2	2
Ethnology	2	2	4
Folia Primatologica	3	1	4
Foundations of Languages	1		1
History of Religion	1		1

TABLE 24--Continued

	Duke	U. N. C.	Total
Human Biology		1	1
Human Ecology		1	1
Human Organization		9	9
Indian Linguistics	1		1
Instituto Nacional de Antropologia e Historia Boletin		1	1
International Journal of American Linguistics	2	1	3
International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies		1	1
Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion	1		1
Journal of African History		1	1
Journal of Asian Studies	2		2
Journal of Comparative Family Studies		1	1
Journal of Dental Research	1		1
Journal of Economic History		1	1
Journal of Human Evolution	1		1
Journal of Marriage and the Family	1		1
Journal of Social Work Education		1	1
Journal of Zoology (London)	1		1
Language	5	2	7
Liberian Studies Journal		1	1
Linguistic Inquiry	1	1	2
Linguistics		1	1
London Times Literary Supplement		1	1
Man	4		4
Medical Anthropology Newsletter		1	1
Museo Nacional de Antropologia e Historia Boletin		1	1
National Geographic		1	1
Natural History	2	2	4
Nature	9	1	10
New York Academy of Sciences Annals		1	1
Neurology		1	1
Niewe West-Indische Gids		1	1
Orbis		1	1
Orthopsychiatry		1	1
Peterson's Photographic	1		1
Playboy	1		1
Program in Ethnographic Film Newsletter	1		1
Psychology Today	1		1
Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland Journal (now merged with Man)		1	1
Rural Sociology		1	1
Saturday Review of Science	1		1
Science	7	10	17
Scientific American	2	1	3
Semiotica	1		1

TABLE 24--Continued

	Duke	U. N. C.	Total
Social and Economic Studies		2	2
Social Casework		1	1
Social Forces		1	1
Southwestern Journal of Anthropology	6	11	17
Time	1		1
Transcultural Psychiatry		1	1
Urban Anthropology	1	1	2
World Archaeology		1	1
Total	122	166	288

[a]One U. N. C. anthropologist included reports of the American Indian Museum and Heye Foundation, and one Duke respondent included memoirs and bulletins of the British Museum, Smithsonian Institution, Yale, and Peabody Museum.

TABLE 25

INDEXES AND ABSTRACTS[a]

	Duke	U. N. C.	Total
Abstracts in Anthropology	1	1	2
African Abstracts	1	2	3
American Doctoral Dissertations		1	1
American Mammalian Society bibliographies	1		1
Bavarian National Library Catalogue	1		1
Biennial Review of Anthropology	1	1	2
Biological Abstracts	3	2	5
Bibliotheque Nationale Catalogue	1		1
British Museum Catalogue	1		1
British Museum of Natural History Catalogue	1		1
Current Contents	2		2
Current Primate References	3		3
Dissertation Abstracts International	1	3	4
Excerpta Medica		1	1
Geographical Abstracts		1	1
Harvard University Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology Catalogue		1	1
Index Medicus	1	2	3
International Anthropological and Linguistic Review		1	1
International Bibliography of Sociology	1		1
International Bibliography of the Social Sciences		1	1
International Index to the Social Sciences	2	3	5
Language and Language Behavior Abstracts	1		1
New York Times Index		1	1
Psychological Abstracts	1		1
Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature	2		2
Royal Anthropological Institute Anthropological Index to Current Periodicals		1	1
Sociological Abstracts		1	1
Unesco Index		1	1
World Agriculture, Economics and Rural Sociology Abstracts		1	1
Total	25	25	50
None	5	6	11
n=	19	25	44

[a]Ten other responses include library card catalog, N. C. union catalog, Carolina Population Center Library's computerized index, serials catalogs, and indexes within journals.

TABLE 26

IMPORTANCE OF FORMS OF LITERATURE AND EASE OF SUCCESS IN THEIR USE (FACULTY RESPONDENTS)

	Importance				Ease			
	G[a]	M	L	T	E	M	D	T
Elementary (undergrad) texts	0	9	11	20	10	6	1	17
Advanced (grad) texts	4	11	6	21	13	4	0	17
All monographs	12	7	2	21	14	3	1	18
Foreign monographs	6	8	5	19	8	4	5	17
American journals	16	5	1	22	17	2	0	19
Foreign journals	7	10	4	21	9	8	1	18
Review publications	6	7	7	20	13	2	2	17
Government publications	0	7	14	21	7	4	6	17
International organization publications	1	11	7	19	5	8	3	16
Technical reports	3	8	8	19	3	9	3	15
Encyclopedias	0	3	17	20	10	4	1	15
Dictionaries and glossaries	6	5	9	20	14	2	1	17
Handbooks	1	10	8	19	7	6	2	15
Master's theses, manuscripts, and other unpublished materials	4	3	15	22	8	3	7	18
Doctoral dissertations	5	5	12	22	8	4	6	18
Newspapers	2	9	10	21	10	5	1	16
Maps	4	9	7	20	8	7	1	16
Human Relations Area Files	1	2	17	20	6	6	4	16

(n=23)

[a]G=great, moderate, L=little, E=easy, D=difficult, T=total.

[b]One respondent answered "never consulted."

[c]One respondent implied "not applicable."

TABLE 27

IMPORTANCE OF FORMS OF LITERATURE AND EASE OF SUCCESS IN THEIR USE (STUDENT RESPONDENTS)

	Importance				Ease			
	G[a]	M	L	T	E	M	D	T
Elementary (undergrad) texts	7	9	23	39	29	5	1	35
Advanced (grad) texts	15	21	3	39	19	13	3	35
All monographs	22	14	4	40	11	22	3	36
Foreign monographs	5	8	23	36	2	11	14	27
American journals	32	8	1	41	22	12	2	36
Foreign journals	6	16	14	36	3	14	14	31
Review publications	4	20	12	36	12	16	2	30
Government publications	3	9	25	37	6	11	10	27
International organization publications	3	16	17	36	7	14	4	25
Technical reports	2	14	18	34	5	12	11	28
Encyclopedias	1	4	26	31	22	2	2	26
Dictionaries and glossaries[b]	9	8	15	32	21	3	2	26
Handbooks[b]	4	10	18	32	14	9	2	25
Master's theses, manuscripts, and other unpublished materials[c]	9	11	17	37	4	12	14	30
Doctoral dissertations[c]	8	16	13	37	5	11	13	29
Newspapers	3	6	24	33	12	6	5	23
Maps	10	12	13	35	11	8	9	28
Human Relations Area Files[d]	3	8	23	34	6	7	9	22

(n=41)

[a]G=great, M=moderate, L=little, E=easy, D=difficult, T=total.

[b]One respondent answered "not applicable."

[c]One respondent answered "never consulted."

[d]Two respondents answered "never consulted."

TABLE 28

IMPORTANCE OF FORMS OF LITERATURE AND EASE OF SUCCESS IN THEIR USE (DUKE RESPONDENTS)

	Importance				Ease			
	G[a]	M	L	T	E	M	D	T
Elementary (undergrad) texts	2	9	13	24	17	4	2	23
Advanced (grad) texts	10	12	3	25	13	9	1	23
All monographs	14	11	2	27	13	10	3	26
Foreign monographs	3	7	14	24	4	9	8	21
American journals	21	4	2	27	18	6	1	25
Foreign journals	9	9	7	25	6	10	8	24
Review publications	7	14	5	26	14	7	3	24
Government publications	3	4	18	25	5	8	8	21
International organization publications	1	13	11	25	4	13	5	22
Technical reports	3	8	14	25	2	10	10	22
Encyclopedias[b]	1	4	17	22	17	2	1	20
Dictionaries and glossaries[b]	10	5	7	22	18	3	0	21
Handbooks[b]	1	10	11	22	11	7	1	19
Master's theses, manuscripts, and other unpublished materials	5	6	15	26	7	7	9	23
Doctoral dissertations[c]	4	9	12	25	7	6	9	22
Newspapers[b]	4	5	15	24	14	5	3	22
Maps	8	7	9	24	14	4	5	23
Human Relations Area Files[d]	1	4	17	22	6	4	5	15

(n=27)

[a]G=great, M=moderate, L=little, E=easy, D=difficult, T=total.

[b]One respondent answered "not applicable."

[c]One respondent answered "never consulted."

[d]Two respondents answered "never consulted," and one implied "not applicable."

TABLE 29

IMPORTANCE OF FORMS OF LITERATURE AND EASE OF SUCCESS IN THEIR USE (U. N. C. RESPONDENTS)

	Importance				Ease			
	G[a]	M	L	T	E	M	D	T
Elementary (undergrad) texts	5	9	21	35	22	7	0	29
Advanced (grad) texts	9	20	6	35	19	8	2	29
All monographs	20	10	4	34	12	15	1	28
Foreign monographs	8	9	14	31	6	6	11	23
American journals	27	9	0	36	21	8	1	30
Foreign journals	4	17	11	32	6	12	7	25
Review publications	3	13	14	30	11	11	1	23
Government publications	12	21	4	37	8	7	8	23
International organization publications	3	14	13	30	8	9	2	19
Technical reports	2	14	12	28	6	11	4	21
Encyclopedias[b]	0	4	26	30	15	4	2	21
Dictionaries and glossaries	5	8	17	30	17	2	3	22
Handbooks	4	10	15	29	10	8	3	21
Master's theses, manuscripts, and other unpublished materials	8	8	17	33	5	8	12	25
Doctoral dissertations	9	12	13	34	6	9	10	25
Newspapers	1	10	19	30	8	6	3	17
Maps	6	14	11	31	5	11	5	21
Human Relations Area Files	3	6	23	32	6	9	8	23

(n=37)

[a]G=great, M=moderate, L=little, E=easy, D=difficult, T=total.

[b]One respondent answered "never consulted."

TABLE 30

IMPORTANCE OF LIBRARY SERVICES FOR FACULTY

	Now					Future			
	S	V	N1	N2	T	Y	N3	N2	T
Loans and photocopies supplied	12	9	0		21	12			12
Quick reference service, e.g., telephone	11	3	2		16	4			4
Brief literature search	14	2	2		18	4			4
Comprehensive literature search, e.g., bibliography	12	3	2		17	2	3		5
Critical survey of literature	6	7	2	1	15	4	2	1	7
Translations	11	4	2		17	6	1		7
Abstracts of specified articles	10	4	2		16	6	1		7
Editorial assistance, e.g., proofreading	10	2	1	1	14	2	2	1	5
Help in location of audio-visual materials	10	4	1	1	16	3		1	4
Guidance by library staff	10	8	0		18	4		1	5
Library accession lists	14	2	1		17	4	1		5

(n=23)

[a]S=sometimes important, V=very important, N1=never important or never utilized, N2=not applicable, T=total, Y=yes, N3=no.

TABLE 31

IMPORTANCE OF LIBRARY SERVICES FOR STUDENTS

	Now					Future		
	S[a]	V	N1	N2	T	Y	N3	T
Loans and photocopies supplied	13	22	1		36	24	1	25
Quick reference service, e.g., telephone	24	7	2		33	15	1	16
Brief literature search	12	18	2		32	15	1	16
Comprehensive literature search, e.g., bibliography	12	20	2		34	14	1	15
Critical survey of literature	11	14	2		27	6	1	7
Translations	18	8	3		29	9	1	10
Abstracts of specified articles	20	11	2		33	7	1	8
Editorial assistance, e.g., proofreading	18	4	3		25	2	1	3
Help in location of audio-visual materials	20	4	2	1	27	6	1	7
Guidance by library staff	22	10	0		32	4	1	5
Library accession lists	11	13	1		25	7	1	8

(n=41)

[a]S=sometimes important, V=very important, N1=never important or never utilized, N2=not applicable, T-total, Y=yes, N3=no.

TABLE 32

IMPORTANCE OF LIBRARY SERVICES FOR DUKE RESPONDENTS

	Now					Future			
	S[a]	V	N1	N2	T	Y	N3	N2	T
Loans and photocopies supplied	9	14	1		24	14			14
Quick reference service, e.g., telephone	15	4	3		22	9			9
Brief literature search	12	8	3		23	6			6
Comprehensive literature search, e.g., bibliography	12	9	3		24	5	1		6
Critical survey of literature	6	12	3	1	22	3			3
Translations	14	6	3		23	4			4
Abstracts of specified articles	13	6	3		22	6			6
Editorial assistance, e.g., proofreading	14	3	3	1	21	2		1	3
Help in location of audio-visual materials	12	6	2	2	22	4		1	5
Guidance by library staff	16	9	0		25	6		1	7
Library accession lists	13	6	2		21	5	1		6

(n=27)

[a]S=sometimes important, V=very important, N1=never important or never utilized, N2=not applicable, T=total, Y=yes, N3=no.

TABLE 33

IMPORTANCE OF LIBRARY SERVICES FOR U. N. C. RESPONDENTS

	Now				Future		
	S[a]	V	N1	T	Y	N2	T
Loans and photocopies supplied	16	17	0	33	22	1	23
Quick reference service, e.g., telephone	20	6	1	27	10	1	11
Brief literature search	14	12	1	27	13	1	14
Comprehensive literature search, e.g., bibliography	12	14	1	27	11	3	14
Critical survey of literature	11	9	1	21	7	3	10
Translations	15	6	2	23	11	2	13
Abstracts of specified articles	17	9	1	27	7	2	9
Editorial assistance, e.g., proofreading	14	3	1	18	2	3	5
Help in location of audio-visual materials	18	2	1	21	5	1	6
Guidance by library staff	16	9	0	25	2	1	3
Library accession lists	12	9	0	21	6	1	7

(n=37)

[a]S=sometimes important, V=very important, N1=never important or never utilized, T=total, Y=yes, N2=no.

TABLE 34

PROBLEMS OF FACULTY MEMBERS IN GATHERING INFORMATION

	F[a]	S	N	Total
Not knowing where to go for information	2	16	3	21
Incomplete coverage by index and abstracting services	6	14	2	22
Unsatisfactory indexing by index and abstracting services	8	11	3	22
Inadequate or insufficient help from library staff	1	10	11	22
Inadequate cataloging of library materials	10	10	2	22
Difficulty in obtaining foreign publications	5	13	3	21
Difficulty in obtaining unpublished material	9	7	5	21
Difficulty in obtaining technical reports	3	10	5	18
Not enough copies of some material	10	10	1	21
Published information in your area of specialization is inadequate	8	9	4	21
Library collections in your area of specialization are inadequately organized	8	5	8	21
Information published is not up-to-date	10	6	5	21
Information available is not up-to-date	8	8	4	20
Difficulty in locating material listed in card catalog	7	8	6	21
Library collections in your home university are too scattered	10	4	7	21
Library collections in your home university are inadequate	6	9	6	21
Library collections in the Triangle Region are inadequate	5	8	8	21

(n=23)

[a]F=frequently, S=sometimes, N=never.

TABLE 35

PROBLEMS OF STUDENTS IN GATHERING INFORMATION

	F[a]	S	N	Total
Not knowing where to go for information	5	34	1	40
Incomplete coverage by index and abstracting services	13	22	3	38
Unsatisfactory indexing by index and abstracting services	10	22	4	36
Inadequate or insufficient help from library staff	3	22	15	40
Inadequate cataloging of library materials	9	25	3	37
Difficulty in obtaining foreign publications	8	20	7	35
Difficulty in obtaining unpublished material	21	11	6	38
Difficulty in obtaining technical reports	5	12	15	32
Not enough copies of some material	22	11	5	38
Published information in your area of specialization is inadequate	12	21	1	34
Library collections in your area of specialization are inadequately organized	18	14	4	36
Information published is not up-to-date	15	17	4	36
Information available is not up-to-date	18	15	3	36
Difficulty in locating material listed in card catalog	10	20	9	39
Library collections in your home university are too scattered	16	14	7	37
Library collections in your home university are inadequate	16	17	3	36
Library collections in the Triangle Region are inadequate	6	15	10	31

(n=41)

[a]F=frequently, S=sometimes, N=never.

TABLE 36

PROBLEMS OF DUKE RESPONDENTS IN GATHERING INFORMATION

	F[a]	S	N	Total
Not knowing where to go for information	5	20	2	27
Incomplete coverage by index and abstracting services	7	15	4	26
Unsatisfactory indexing by index and abstracting services	8	13	4	25
Inadequate or insufficient help from library staff	2	12	13	27
Inadequate cataloging of library materials	6	14	4	24
Difficulty in obtaining foreign publications	7	13	5	25
Difficulty in obtaining unpublished material	11	10	5	26
Difficulty in obtaining technical reports	5	10	9	24
Not enough copies of some material	17	6	2	25
Published information in your area of specialization is inadequate	8	12	3	23
Library collections in your area of specialization are inadequately organized	11	8	6	25
Information published is not up-to-date	12	9	4	25
Information available is not up-to-date	12	8	4	24
Difficulty in locating material listed in card catalog	7	14	6	27
Library collections in your home university are too scattered	14	6	6	26
Library collections in your home university are inadequate	9	11	5	25
Library collections in the Triangle Region are inadequate	5	8	9	22

(n=27)

[a]F=frequently, S=sometimes, N=never.

TABLE 37

PROBLEMS OF U. N. C. RESPONDENTS IN GATHERING INFORMATION

	F[a]	S	N	Total
Not knowing where to go for information	2	30	2	34
Incomplete coverage by index and abstracting services	12	21	1	34
Unsatisfactory indexing by indexing and abstracting services	10	20	3	33
Inadequate or insufficient help from library staff	2	20	13	35
Inadequate cataloging of library materials	13	21	1	35
Difficulty in obtaining foreign publications	6	20	5	31
Difficulty in obtaining unpublished material	19	8	6	33
Difficulty in obtaining technical reports	3	12	11	26
Not enough copies of some material	15	15	4	34
Published information in your area of specialization is inadequate	12	18	2	32
Library collections in your area of specialization are inadequately organized	15	11	6	32
Information published is not up-to-date	13	14	5	32
Information available is not up-to-date	14	15	3	32
Difficulty in locating material listed in card catalog	10	14	9	33
Library collections in your home university are too scattered	12	12	8	32
Library collections in your home university are inadequate	13	15	4	32
Library collections in the Triangle Region are inadequate	6	15	9	30

(n=37)

[a]F=frequently, S=sometimes, N=never.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altshuler, Meredith T. Medical Anthropology: a Case Study of Inter-disciplinary Information Needs. Unpublished research paper, School of Library Science. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1969.

Amsden, Diana. "Information Problems of Anthropologists." College and Research Libraries, XXIX (March, 1968), 117-31.

Appel, John and Gurr, Ted. "Bibliographic Needs of Social and Behavioral Scientists: Report of a Pilot Survey." American Behavioral Scientist, VII (June, 1964), 51-54.

Barger, Daphne. Serially Published Bibliographies in the Field of Anthropology for the Twentieth Century. Unpublished research paper, School of Library Science. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1971.

Beckham, Rexford S. "Anthropology." Library Trends, XV (April, 1967), 685-703.

Bisco, Ralph L. "Social Science Data Archives: a Review of Developments." American Political Science Review, LX (March, 1966), 93-109.

Boehm, Eric H. "Dissemination of Knowledge in the Humanities and Social Sciences." American Council of Learned Societies Newsletter, XIV (May, 1963), 3-12.

Brittain, J. M. Information and its Users; a Review with Special Reference to the Social Sciences. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1970.

Bry, Ilse and Afflerbach, Lois. "In Search of an Organizing Principle for the Behavioral Science Literature." Mental Health Book Review Index. Vol. X. New York Council on Research in Bibliography, 1965.

Davis, Vincent. "A Proposed Bibliography Bank for the Behavioral Sciences." American Behavioral Scientist, VII (June, 1964), 67-70.

Diesurud, Juul, The Scope and Content of the Science of Anthropology. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1908.

Ford, Clellan S. "The Role of HRAF in the Organization of Knowledge about Behavior and Mankind." Behavior Science Notes, I (1966), 3-6.

Frantz, Charles. The Student Anthropologist's Handbook; a Guide to Research, Training, and Career. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Pub. Co., 1972.

Fried, Morton. "Libraries and Books." The Study of Anthropology. New York: Crowell, 1972.

Gann, Lewis H. "Archives and the Study of Society." Rhodes-Livingstone Journal, XX (1956), 49-67.

Garfield, Eugene and Sher, Irving H. "ASCA (Automatic Subject Citation Alert): a New Personalized Current Awareness Service for Scientists." American Behavioral Scientist, X (Jan., 1967), 29-32.

Gulick, Melba C. "Nonconventional Data Sources and Reference Tools for Social Science and Humanities." College and Research Libraries, XXIX (May, 1968), 224-34.

Gurr, Ted and Panofsky, Hans, eds. "Information Retrieval in the Social Sciences: Problems, Programs, and Proposals." American Behavioral Scientist, VII (June, 1964).

Harris, Marvin. The Rise of Anthropological Theory; a History of Theories of Culture. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1968.

Herrick, Mary Darrah. "Bibliographical Problems from New Countries in Africa." College and Research Libraries, XXVIII (Sept., 1967), 347-50.

Hymes, Dell, ed. The Use of Computers in Anthropology. The Hague: Mouton, 1965.

Janda, Kenneth. "Keyword Indexes for the Behavioral Sciences." American Behavioral Scientist, VII (June, 1964), 55-58.

Jocano, F. Landa. "Documentation as a Field Technique in Anthropological Research." Journal of Philippine Librarianship, II (Mar. and Sept., 1969), 15-24.

Koh, Hesung C. "An Automated Bibliographic System: HABS." Behavior Science Notes, IV (1969), 70-79.

_____. "A Social Science Bibliographic System: Computer Applications." American Behavioral Scientist, X (Jan., 1967), 2-5.

_____. "A Social Science Bibliographic System: Orientation and Framework." Behavior Science Notes, I (1966), 145-63.

_____. "Toward an Integrated Information System for Asian Studies." Newsletter of the Association for Asian Studies, XVI (Feb., 1971), 12-27.

Kyle, Barbara. "Some Further Considerations on the Application to Social Science Material of Up-to-Date Methods of Bibliographic Control and Information Retrieval." Journal of Documentation, XIV (Dec., 1958), 190-96.

Levi-Strauss, Claude. "The Place of Anthropology in the Social Sciences and the Problems Raised in Teaching It." The University Teaching of Sociology, Social Psychology, and Anthropology. Paris: Unesco, 1954.

Lord, Jean B. "The Use of United States Government Publications as Research Literature in Anthropology." American Anthropologist, LXVI (Feb., 1964), 132-34.

Mandelbaum, David G.; Lasker, Gabriel G.; and Albert, Ethel M., eds. Resources for the Teaching of Anthropology. Memoir 95 of the American Anthropological Association, 1963.

_____. The Teaching of Anthropology. Memoir 94 of the American Anthropological Association, 1963.

Moore, Frank W. "Problems and Prospects for Cooperative Bibliographic Control." Behavior Science Notes, IV (1969), 57-62.

_____. "Social Science Documentation." Special Libraries, XLIX (Nov., 1958), 421-26.

Morrison, Donald G. "Indexing the Human Relations Area Files." American Behavioral Scientist, VII (June, 1964), 49-50.

_____. "The Human Relations Area Files Index." American Behavioral Scientist, X (Feb., 1967), 27-30.

Murdock, George P. "The Processing of Anthropological Materials." Anthropology Today. Edited by A. L. Kroeber. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Naroll, Raoul. "HRAF: The Way Forward." Behavior Science Notes, VIII (1973), 1-4.

National Research Council. Committee on Information in the Behavioral Sciences. Communication Systems and Resources in the Behavioral Sciences. Washington, D. C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1967.

O'Barr, William M., and O'Barr, Jean F. "Computer Keyword Indexing: Application to Current Anthropology." Current Anthropology, VII (Dec., 1966), 632-64.

Pearson, J. D. "African Bibliography Since the Nairobi Conference." Libraries in East Africa. Edited by Anna-Britta Wallenius. Uppsala: The Scandinavian Institute of African Studies, 1971.

_____, and Jones, Ruth. "African Bibliography." Africa, XXXVIII (July, 1968), 293-331.

Pelto, Pertti J. "Appendix C: On Using Computers." Anthropological Research: The Structure of Inquiry. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Perman, Dagmar H. "Computers and Bibliography for the Social Sciences." American Archivist, XXXII (Jan., 1969), 15-20.

Pitt, David C. Using Historical Sources in Anthropology and Sociology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

Rider, Fremont. The Scholar and the Future of the Research Library. New York City: Hadham Press, 1944.

Routh, S. J., and McPherson, M. "On the Indexing of Anthropological Journals." College and Research Libraries, XXIX (July, 1968), 313-14.

Rowe, John H. "Library Problems in the Teaching of Anthropology." Resources for the Teaching of Anthropology. Edited by David G. Mandelbaum, Gabriel G. Lasker, and Ethel Albert. Memoir 95 of the American Anthropological Association.

"Special Conference Supplement: Toward an Automated, Comprehensive East Asian Bibliographic System." Behavior Science Notes, IV (1969), pp. 1-85.

Thompson, Lawrence S. "Bibliographic Control of Linguistic Scholarship." Journal of Documentation, XXIII (June, 1967), 99-109.

Tucker, Sara Jones. "Archival Materials for the Anthropologist in the National Archives, Washington, D. C." American Anthropologist, XXXXIII (Oct., 19[illegible] 617-44.

Uyterschaut, L. "Literature Searching Methods in Social Science Research: A Pilot Inquiry." American Behavioral Scientist. IX (May, 1966), 14+.